

THE  
CHURCH REVIEW.

---

VOL. X.

JANUARY, 1858.

No. 4.

---

ART. I.—DR. PUSEY AND THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH, *from the Council of Jerusalem, A. D. 51, to the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381 ; as to their Constitution, but also as to their objects and History.*  
By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D. D., &c., &c., &c.

WE have placed the title of this work at the head of our Article, not because we intend to enter into any disquisition on it, or the topics of which it treats ; but because we have found in it certain prefatory remarks, which seem to us to demand some notice. We are not, we must say in the outset, among those who are peculiarly sensitive to the ordinary strictures of our English brethren. We can readily imagine, that in Church as well as State and other matters, they may find among us a vast many things which may strike them as altogether strange, out of the way, and inexplicable. And if the thought will occasionally occur that they would be much less perplexed and annoyed, if they would not so invariably make "the way they do at home" the single standard by which all men and things are judged, still, we are by no means disposed to complain. For this very insularity or nationality, is, in many respects, a noble thing, and has wrought some noble results. Moreover, we suppose, it lies at the root of that over-

weening estimate of ourselves, to the charge of which we are considered—as no doubt we are—peculiarly obnoxious. We only beg objectors to remember, that however much this disposition may have been exacerbated and increased by climate and other causes, we still in the line of our descent, came very honestly by it.

We ought also to express our sincere conviction, that the great body of the Clergy and Laity of the Mother Church, are animated by no other than the most fraternal feelings towards us. We have received, and are receiving too many proofs of this, to permit any reasonable man to question it. No doubt there are some among them who regard us as only a more orderly kind of Dissenters, because we are not “by law established;” others, who are willing to refer to us as a proof that Monarchy is not essential to the existence of the Episcopacy, and whose sympathies stop with that; others, still, who regard us with suspicion, because we are not merely a Church of England *in* America; and a few, who entertain the fear, once expressed to us by an English clergyman, with more *naïveté* than tact, that a repeal of all inhibitory laws against us, would set in motion a clerical exodus from America, which fleeing from the horrors of the voluntary system, would descend upon the shores of England, and, under the plea of “manifest destiny,” seize on everything available, from the living of Doddington down to the humblest curacy. Indeed, it must be confessed, that the superior facility of locomotion which in the intercourse of a few past years we have exhibited, and which in the interchange of hospitalities, has left us considerably on the debit side, may have given some ground for this last anticipation. We hope, however, it will not be forgotten, that temporary travel, and permanent removal, are two distinct things. Still, we cannot, as we have said, question the fraternal regard of the great body of English Churchmen; and we are sure, they cannot doubt our filial reverence towards the Mother Church, or our hearty recognition of the tie which binds us together as brethren.

It is therefore with unfeigned regret, that we find a *Regius Professor* in the University of Oxford, coming before the Church with statements concerning our ecclesiastical character and position, like those of which we are about to speak. If any heed is given to them either here or in England,—and while with some Dr. Pusey’s name is all powerful, and even with those, who, like ourselves, have no sympathy with his views, his learning and patient industry will always command a respectful hearing—they must result in needless distrust and



suspicion on the one side, and in a feeling of injury and misrepresentation on the other. But our first duty is to lay the strictures in question before our readers :

"Accordingly, until the unhappy precedent, made in very evil times by the Church of the United States, when struggling for life, the question of lay representation was consistently confined to bodies who rejected the Apostolic succession, the Continental reformers, and the dissenters in Great Britain.

"It must be said plainly, that the precedent set in the United States is radically wrong, and, in fact, is so far, the adoption of a principle belonging to bodies who reject the Apostolic succession and the whole principle of a deposit of faith, and of a commission, transmitted from the apostles and part of the mind of Christ. Yet, in so saying, I do not mean, (God forbid !) that she has thereby forfeited her claim to be a part of the Church. She has abandoned a bulwark of the faith, a function of the office inherited by her Bishops, not the faith itself, nor the Apostolic succession.

"Through our neglect she became what she became ; and we owe her therefore not sympathy only, but a respectful and humble sorrow. Still, while we own our own share in the sin, and that through God's mercy alone we have been preserved, it were thanklessness for our own mercies not to own, that she has undergone loss. Nestorianism and Eutychianism were not the produce of one generation only, nor are they extinct. The Athanasian Creed is at once the bulwark against those heresies, and the clearest exposition of the deepest truths on the very Being of God. It sets forth in clearest terms the Being of God Almighty in Himself, and in the relation which through us, His lowest creatures, He vouchsafed to form with his whole rational creation. On those truths the human mind must dwell, if it would think at all on God, its Author and its End, and on its redeeming Lord. Thoughts like those which the Athanasian Creed so wonderfully embodies, must come across every reflective mind. The soul must think in some way on every subject mentioned in that Creed, if it rises above the toils or pleasures of this earth to dwell upon its God. Yet error lies as near to the mind of man as truth. Error is manifold, truth one. And therefore there is the more danger lest the soul of man should go astray, where it would most need and long to think aright, where error would estrange it from its God and Saviour as He is. It was a loss, then, that, misunderstanding its solemn warnings to those who willfully part with the faith, the American Church allowed one of the clearest expositions of that faith silently to drop from them. They parted, not only with the Creed itself, but with the very confession that it 'ought thoroughly to be received and believed.' They did not mean to part with the faith from their heart, but they parted with its confession from their lips. In like way, they did not deny, but they ignored the value of absolution.

"They did not deny, but in both instances they suppressed the truth. It is plain, then, that in the future history of the Church, either we must

be the instrument of God in upholding their faith, or they, if we enter into closer relations with them, will lower ours. Not then in reproach, but in self-defense it was said, that a Church which had 'omitted the Athanasian Creed, and bracketed the Nicene,' was no model to be safely copied.

"The admission of laymen to a co-ordinate voice in Councils on the faith, is not an heretical act. Yet, it is an innovation upon that rule which the inspired Apostles left with the Church. To depart from their rule must needs be the commencement of a perilous course, the issue of which God alone knoweth, and from which may He preserve us."

These words—and their writer has almost universally the credit of carefully weighing what he says—involve some grave conclusions. Unless we are greatly mistaken, Dr. Pusey has made no secret of his conviction that the Church of England is in a sorely mutilated and crippled state; that she has parted with much of her Christian birthright; that she has *approached*, at least, a position where her claim to be considered an integral portion of the Catholic Church may be questioned; and, now, the farther conclusion is announced, that we have fallen to such a lower depth, and come so much nearer to excluding ourselves from the Body of Christ, that not only is not our example a safe one to follow, but that even *closer* relations with us, will, unless our tone is thereby raised—and all the chances of course lie the other way—lower the tone of the Mother Church. It is easy to assert, that such a sentiment is uttered, "not in reproach, but in self-defense." That very conviction, if it be real, involves—whether justly or unjustly facts must decide—the very greatest possible reproach.

Nor can we avoid remarking, that the announcement of these views follows directly on a movement originated by the Bishop of Maryland,\* in the last General Convention, which, if carried out, might bring about those "closer relations" which Dr. Pusey and others who are in the opposite extreme from him, unite in dreading. Had Dr. Pusey designed, so far as his name had influence, and his views carried weight, to put an *estoppel* to that movement, a more opportune season for the accomplishment of such a purpose, could scarcely have been selected.

But we pass on, to consider the charges on which we have been brought, not so much to trial, as to condemnation. They are four in number. We have "ignored the value of Absolution." We have "bracketed the Nicene Creed." We have "parted with the confession" of the faith "from our lips."

---

\* Journal of 1856, pp. 202, 206.

We have admitted into our Synods and Councils Lay representatives. And in doing this, we are charged with departing from the position of our Mother Church, in particulars at least important, possibly something more. These are serious charges, taken in connection with the consequences which Dr. Pusey deduces from them. If we have anything to say, it surely becomes us to say it.

What proof, then, we ask, is there in our formularies, that our Church ignores any value which the Church of England attaches to Absolution? For, in taking up Dr. Pusey's first charge, we must ask our readers to remember, that this is the only question we are answering. We are not discussing the nature or value of Absolution. We are not inquiring whether Dr. Pusey's own views on these points are, or are not, the views of the English Church. The single topic now under examination—and we wish especially to insist upon the distinction herein involved—is, whether any such changes have been made in our American revision of the Book of Common Prayer, as warrant the conclusion, that our Church regards Absolution in any other light than that in which it is regarded by the Mother Church, or attaches to it any inferior value? The nature, value and effects of Absolution, the soundness or unsoundness of Dr. Pusey's own views, their agreement or disagreement with the standards of our Anglican Church, all plainly lie entirely outside of this line of inquiry, and are, therefore, not now under consideration. Having thus cleared the ground, and stated the question, we proceed to the testimony of our Prayer Book.

Nothing which supports Dr. Pusey's allegation can be gathered from the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer. The Absolution, to be said by "the Priest alone," stands there, as it has stood in the English Book since 1552. Had our revision omitted it, it would only have followed, in this respect, the first Book of 1549. Nor does the transference from the Communion Office of the more solemn precatory form, as an option—a provision which we regard as unfortunate—afford any ground for his charge.

In the Office for the Holy Communion there is a change, on which we presume Dr. Pusey mainly rests his assertions. In the Exhortation to be ordinarily read, when warning is given "for the celebration of the Holy Communion," our revision omits to mention "the benefit of Absolution," as one of the things for which a person unable to "quiet his own conscience," is to apply to his Pastor, "or to some other Minister of God's Word." But can anything more be fairly argued from this, than that our Church has omitted to provide for the use of the

Absolution *in private*? Among us, one going to the Minister to "open his griefs," if by counsel and advice he attains to "the quieting of his conscience and the removing of all scruple and doubtfulness,"—and surely, unless this end were gained the Absolution would not be pronounced in private—comes to the public Office, joins in the General Confession, and in company with the faithful, listens to the proclamation of the pardoning mercy of God. What ignoring is there in all this of the *value* of Absolution? What even in the most stringent view of the case, is ignored, except the use of the Absolution *in private*? And if this is tantamount to *ignoring its value*, then for how many centuries was that value ignored by the Catholic Church? Let us proceed to the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. In this, we find in our revision two omissions: first, of the rubric which provides for a special Confession, and, next, of the indicative form of Absolution. Now as to the first of these omissions, it must be remembered that the rubric which orders the examination of the conscience, is retained. And, surely, so long as that examination is in any degree what it should be—and a minister who would not make it such, would neither be very likely to act under the omitted rubric, nor to act to any good purpose if he did—any great special sin can hardly escape the minister's knowledge, or fail to be made the subject of his remark and counsel. So that while the more general provision which is retained, thus necessarily includes the special one which is omitted, we cannot see that any conclusion favorable to Dr. Pusey's allegation, can be drawn from this omission. In regard to the omission of the indicative form of Absolution, two considerations must be borne in mind. As a general rule, a sick person properly prepared for either life or death, will receive at certain times the Holy Communion; in the Office for which, the Absolution will be used in that very form, which as his biographer informs us,\* Bishop Bull, in his last illness, desired to have substituted for the indicative form; "thinking it came nearer to the precatory forms of Absolution mentioned by the Fathers, than any other." But even if this were not so, it is still true that the indicative form of Absolution is of mediæval origin—Brigham† says it was unknown till the twelfth century—while the prayer beginning "O most merciful God, who according to the multitude of Thy mercies," &c., is the *original Absolution*. Mr. Palmer shows this, and adds: ‡ "This ancient Absolution, or reconciliation of a peni-

\* Nelson's Life of Bull, Sec. LXXIX.

† Book XIV, c. 2, Sec. 5.

‡ Origines Liturgicæ, Vol. II, p. 226.

tent near death, is not only found in the old formularies of the English Church, where it was used *long before the preceding indicative form was introduced*, but in the Sacramentary of Gelasius, A. D. 494; and for many centuries was commonly used in the Churches of the West." What, then, has our Church done in this matter, that warrants Dr. Pusey's charge? We have simply omitted a later and mediæval form, and by so doing, have restored to its proper position and rightful place that ancient precatory form, which was used for more than thirteen hundred years in the Western Church. And this is to ignore the value of Absolution! It does, indeed, remove all possible shadow of an idea that we have anything in common with the Mediæval and Romish doctrine of Absolution, but, we ask any candid person, can it be fairly said to do anything more?

One fact remains to be stated. Among the Offices in our American Book, is one—not found in the English—for the Visitation of Prisoners. In this Office there are two Rubrics which bear on our present inquiry. In the first, the Minister is directed, in connection with the examination of the prisoner's conscience, "to exhort him to a particular confession of the sin for which he is condemned;" and in the second, after confession, the Priest is ordered "to declare to him the pardoning mercy of God in the form which is used in the Communion Service." We confess ourselves unable to discover any evidence in this, that our Church "ignores" the value of Absolution."

Our readers can now see for themselves precisely in what points our Prayer Book varies from that of the Mother Church in this matter of the Absolution. And, it appears, the points of difference are two in number. First, our Offices do not recognize the use of the Absolution *in private*, where it may be had in public: and, secondly, they omit that indicative form of Absolution which only dates back to the twelfth century. But neither of these changes in any way involves an opinion as to the *value* of Absolution; neither denies that value, whatever it may be, and as we have already said, *we are not now inquiring what it is*; neither places us on any different ground as regards that value, from the Mother Church; and, unless the Catholic Church of Christ for many centuries ignored the value of Absolution, neither can afford any just foundation for such a charge as the one brought against us by Dr. Pusey. In a word, if Dr. Pusey's view of Absolution be the Mediæval and Romish one, then of course we differ from that, just so far as it differs from the standards of the English Church. If, on the other hand, his view be the Primitive and Scriptural

one of the English Church, then there is no shadow of evidence that we differ from either. And here, we are content to leave our issue with him on this topic.

The allegation next to be considered, is, that we have "bracketed the Nicene Creed." A question appears to have arisen as to the precise meaning of these words. It has been supposed, that by some confusion of ideas, Dr. Pusey intends to refer to the provision in the rubric preceding the Apostles' Creed, that "any Churches may omit the words, *He descended into Hell*, or may instead of them, use the words, *He went into the place of departed spirits*." We presume, however, that reference is made to those rubrical provisions, by which either the Apostles or the Nicene Creed may be used in the Morning and Evening Service, and also in the Office for the Holy Communion. Taking then, this, as Dr. Pusey's meaning, let us inquire how much can fairly be made of this "bracketing the Nicene Creed."

The facts in the case are as follows. At the informal and provisional Convention of 1785, two courses of action were adopted in reference to the Book of Common Prayer. Certain changes in the prayers, rendered necessary by the acknowledged Independence of the United States, were agreed upon. This was evidently a mere matter of necessity; it was only doing by an agreement of many, what individual clergymen had been doing for a long time—some, from the fourth of July, 1776, and all, from the third of September, 1783—substituting, namely, prayers for the authorities of the Republic, in place of those for the Royal Family and Parliament of Great Britain. But, besides this, that provisional Convention *proposed*—of course they could not establish—certain other changes, which were published in the "Proposed Book" in 1786.\* Among these propositions, was one for the entire omission of the Nicene Creed. It met, however, with no favor; Bishop White, who is certainly a most competent witness, says, "the omission had been generally regretted;" it was not endorsed by the second provisional Convention, held in 1786, in which, as the same authority informs us, the Nicene Creed "was restored without debate or difficulty," with the rubrical provision noted above; all which action was confirmed by the consent of all Orders in the Convention of 1789, the first regularly constituted Synod of our Church.

Now, it is true, that as the rubrics stand, a clergyman can, if he will, so avail himself of their option, as to avoid the use of

---

\* We think it admits of some doubt, whether these last named changes were proposed by the Convention, or only by a Committee.



the Nicene Creed, either in the Daily Service or the Communion Office. But, to reach such a result, could not have been the object of the framers of the rubrics. For when the proposition to omit the Nicene Creed had been made in terms, and was "generally regretted" and disliked, to suppose that a rubric *intended* to be tantamount to such an omission, was then presented to, and passed by the very persons who opposed omission, is to reflect not only upon the honesty and honor of the originators of the plan, but also upon the intelligence and common sense of those who suffered themselves to be gulled by it. The circumstances of the case, and the testimony of those concerned in it, alike show that the restitution was intended to be a *bona fide* one. While, as matter of fact, we have never known a clergyman, who supposed himself to be released by our rubric from the use of the Nicene Symbol, or who availed himself of the possible option, to exclude it from the Services. It is moreover fully accepted and acknowledged, in our eighth Article.

The historical details with which we have just been occupied, suggest the propriety of mentioning, in passing, certain facts which must be borne in mind, if we would fairly weigh and understand our American revision of the Book of Common Prayer. We may as well call attention to them here as at any other point; for though they will lead us for a moment from our direct line of remark, they have an important bearing on the topics just discussed, and those which are to follow.

The Convention of 1789, then, when they approached the final revision of the Prayer Book, had not alone in their hands the English Book. They had also before them, and they could not but take cognizance of the Proposed Book of 1786. Their action, therefore, was embarrassed and complicated. And to estimate the spirit which animated them, and the true character of their labors, we must take that Book as the exponent of the extreme of change to which some persons were disposed to go, and compare it with the results which were actually reached. We shall then see how conservative a spirit pervaded the body; and their work will be regarded in a very different light from that in which it would be viewed, had they simply taken the English Book and *originated* changes from it. Vastly greater changes had been proposed by the provisional Conventions preceding; Conventions which, moreover, were partial, both in regard to the number of Dioceses represented, and in their own incomplete constitution, as being made up of Presbyters and Laymen, without Bishops. While, as we have said above, this Convention of 1789 was the first

in which all Orders were represented. Viewed, therefore, in this way, our first full Synod does not appear to be so much engaged in originating changes, as in repressing a spirit of change. And when its labors—which we are not at all attempting to prove perfect and faultless—were completed, it closed them by renewing with an enlarged, distinct and solemn speciality of detail, a Declaration, which had previously been couched in vague and general terms; “that it was *far* from intending to depart from the Church of England, in any essential point of *doctrine, discipline, or worship*.” The change of expression, which becomes apparent on comparing this Declaration with the one put forth in connection with the Proposed Book, is very striking, and, under the circumstances, full of meaning. Nor are the words employed, those of men conscious of having made such vital changes as Dr. Pusey charges on them. It will be long before he will persuade us that the members of our first complete Synod were so dishonest as to take such words on their lips, when they knew them to be false; or so ignorant and stupid as to depart from the Mother Church to the extent which he alleges, without knowing it.

Dr. Pusey’s third allegation is, that we “have parted with the Confession” of the “faith from our lips;” and by this he means, that we have omitted from our formularies the Athanasian Creed. To say the least, this is a needlessly harsh way of putting the matter. And its harshness is not mitigated by the facts, that the Council of Ephesus, in its seventh canon, forbade any other Creed to be composed or used, than “that which was settled by the holy Fathers who were assembled in the city of Nicæa, with the Holy Ghost;” and that the Athanasian Symbol is not used in the public Services of the Orthodox Greek Church. This last mentioned fact, it should be remembered, was distinctly had in view at the time the omission was decided on.\* In reference to the whole subject, we adopt the language of the accomplished correspondent of the *Literary Churchman*. Indeed, did our limits permit, we should be glad to lay his entire letter before our readers.†

“The wise and good men who compiled our Prayer Book, whatever were their defects and failures, at least acted on a principle, and not blindly, in what they did. . . . They regarded that [Creed] *called* the Creed of Athanasius, however venerable and valuable, as a hymn, and not a creed; resting on precisely the same basis as the *Te Deum*, so far as respects the absolute necessity of its being incorporated in any office of daily prayer. Now while, for one, I bitterly deplore the practical

\* Bishop White’s Memoirs, p. 149.

† Letter of A. C. C., in the *Literary Churchman*, of Oct. 17, 1857.



application of this principle, which has cost us so dearly in the matter of worship, I venture to affirm that the principle is a sound one; and that no private doctor, however venerable for learning and piety, has a right to speak so harshly of a great Church, in full communion with his own, as to tax her with 'lowering' the faith, simply because, in common with the Orthodox Church of the Greeks, she does not use the hymn *Quicumque vult* in her public worship. Let it be remembered that, at the same time and for kindred reasons, she omitted the *Magnificat* and the *Nunc Dimittis*, not surely because she did not believe or value them, but because in adapting herself to her new work, she (unwisely, as I humbly conceive, but still with a legitimate exercise of judgment) thought best to present to the people among whom she was to labor, a Common Prayer, as far as possible from those things to which hereditary pride and long and painful prejudice had made them obstinately adverse.

"Now, in omitting the Athanasian Creed as a *hymn*, did she do so without adequate safeguards as to the profession of the faith contained in that hymn? On the contrary, in retaining the service for Trinity Sunday, with its Collect and Preface, in retaining the invocations in the Litany, and in giving greater prominence to the Nicene Creed, she regarded herself as sufficiently setting forth the great doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. But that was not enough—she took the precaution to assert in the preface to her Prayer Book, 'that this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England, in any essential point of *doctrine, discipline, or worship*, or further than local circumstances require.'

"It is worthy of note, that as soon as possible after this 'the Bishops, Clergy and Laity,' in synod, added to the book an Office of Institution, in which not only is the soundest and most Catholic view of the sacerdotal office, and its connections with the episcopate, recognized and embodied, but also there are introduced three successive Collects—the first of which is addressed to the FATHER, the second to the SON, and the third to the HOLY GHOST. Does this look as if there had been any *lowering* of the Faith in the Triune God?"

To what is here said it must be also added, that a further proof of entire orthodoxy was given, when, in 1801, the Thirty Nine Articles were adopted; in which the omission of the Athanasian Creed, in the VIIIth Article, is more than counterbalanced by the adoption of the first five Articles, which reproduce, in its completeness of doctrinal statement, the Athanasian Symbol.

We have reached the last and principal *gravamen* of Dr. Pusey; the matter, namely, of Lay representation. The other three subjects are introduced as illustrations of the result of this ecclesiastical regulation, and warnings to English Churchmen, not to be attracted towards a system, the issues of

which are supposed to have been so disastrous.\* The assertion is, that in recognizing the principle of Lay representation, we have departed from the usages of all bodies possessing Apostolical Succession, in all times and places. Now this clearly involves a double charge: first, a general one of departing from the usage of the Catholic Church; and secondly, a special one of departing from the usage of the Church of England.

In regard to both these charges, Dr. Pusey offers us the benefit of an excuse, under which we can consent to shelter neither ourselves, nor our fathers. Whether the idea were right or wrong, it was imagined that Lay representation in matters ecclesiastical, was a thing recognized both in the Early Church, and in the Church of England. The idea entertained, was, unquestionably, the one expressed in a letter of Dr. Bowden, published in 1792, with the approval of Bishop Seabury, that the principle of Lay representation was justified by Reason, Revelation, and Precedent. We cannot therefore accept Dr. Pusey's excuse—however kindly it may be intended—that evil times and untoward circumstances forced this principle upon us. Whatever is to be said for or against it, we went into it with our eyes open; while the communions around us—aside from the Romish Church—in which we see Lay representation ignored, so far from retaining the Succession, scout it as an antiquated shred of Popery.†

Into the general charge we shall not here enter. Not because we have nothing to say; but because our line of remark has led us rather to consider ourselves in relation to the Church of England, and to endeavor at least, to show that we have not in the matters charged so departed from her position as to justify any of her members in using such words as those of Dr. Pusey. For this reason, and because, moreover, our limits restrict us, we confine ourselves here to the questions: Did our Church inaugurate *a principle* unknown to the English Church, when she admitted laymen to a share in her Synods? And if she did not, then what was her action in the premises?

It was not supposed at the time, that any new principle was adopted. In the pamphlet above referred to, it is distinctly asserted that in recognizing the principle of Lay representation, we were only doing what the Church of England had already done under another form. And we believe the truth

\* It is obvious to remark, that it does not at all follow that the matters previously charged, even if they were admitted as truly charged, are necessarily connected with Lay representation. *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, is not an uncommon fallacy.

† As, for instance, the Presbyterians and Methodists.

of this position may be as nearly demonstrated, as anything can be, which depends on moral reasoning.

We go back, then, and take our stand on the declarations and arguments of Richard Hooker. In the Eighth Book of his Polity, he brings out and advocates the principle of a General Synod, in which both Clergy and Laity are represented. He holds that no laws, civil or ecclesiastical, can become "naturally" or "religiously" binding in England, without the united action of Clergy and Laity. And the General Synod in which this action is had, he finds in Parliament and Convocation sitting concurrently. "The Parliament of England," he says, "together with the Convocation thereto annexed, is that upon which the very essence of all government within this kingdom doth depend." For he will not grant that Parliament is a merely "temporal court," and Bramhall asserts the same thing.\* Here, then, we have broadly stated the principle of Lay representation in matters ecclesiastical; and we see, moreover, in what way the principle took form, namely, in the joint action of Convocation as the Clerical, and Parliament as the Lay Synod of the Church of England. We are not concerned here to enquire whether the principle thus avowed by Hooker was inaugurated by our Mother Church at the Reformation; it is enough for our present purposes to show what has been shown. Still, we have no doubt, the arrangement was regarded as a return to the ancient customs of the nation, antedating the Papal usurpations. Bramhall, at least, clearly so regards it.†

The principle of Lay representation being thus proved to have been recognized in the Mother Church, and the mode of its working appearing to have been provided for, through the action of Parliament sitting as a Lay Synod, we must next briefly consider the history of this arrangement, its progress, changes and results. We shall then be prepared to state our conclusions.

When Hooker wrote, the whole English nation constituted, in the eye of the law, not merely one Commonwealth, but one Church. So he repeatedly says, "there is not a man of the Church of England, but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth; nor any member of the Commonwealth, which is not also of the Church of England."‡ And this

\* Defense of Protestant's Ordination, Sec. 6.

† Just Vindication, C. IV. Jackson, also, accounts the exclusion of the Laity, a piece of Romish treason. On Christian Obedience, C. I, § 8.

‡ Eccl. Polity, VIII, I, 2; compare also, I, 5. See also Canons CXXXIX, and CXL, of 1603.

view is confirmed by Stat. 35, Elizabeth, C. I, 1592.\* But such a view of the case, almost immediately became unreal, and a fiction. People did, in various directions, desert the communion of the Church of England; and then an arrangement just to all parties, would have been to open Parliament to others besides members of the Church of England, and to take from it its character as a Lay Synod of that Church, and provide for Lay representation in some other way. No such course however was adopted. Two distinct lines of policy were consecutively pursued. Till 1688, the Act of Elizabeth above referred to, was continued in force; and it preserved to the Parliament its character as a Lay Synod of the Church. In 1688, that Act was repealed, and the Commonwealth and the Church ceased even in the eye of the law, to be identical. But, though this was so, the Test and Corporation Acts continued in force, and gave to Parliament some sort of claim to be still regarded in its old character of a Lay Synod. In 1828, however, these Acts were repealed; in 1829, Papists were admitted to Parliament; in 1833, the Reform Bill swept away the last vestige of the ancient character of Parliament as a Lay Synod, and though it has continued to act in this capacity, all the original conditions which gave it its character as a Lay Synod, have ceased to exist. And this is not all; for while the character of Parliament has thus vitally changed, the abeyance of the proper powers of Convocation has thrown all legislation for the Church into its hands; the hands of a body, which is in no sense made up of even *lay* representatives of the Church. Till 1688, then, the Commonwealth was hardly dealt with; and since 1688, a course of still greater injustice has been adopted with regard to the Church.

We are now prepared to consider the action of our own Church, in this matter of Lay representation. She has adopted no *principle*, which there was not abundant reason to believe, was received and acted on, in the Reformed Church of England. If the great authorities of that Church and the actual history of her ecclesiastical legislation,† can be relied on, she has only continued a principle acknowledged from the time of the Reformation. What she has done, has been simply to provide for it, a *new mode of application*, and a *new form of working*. We need not be surprised to find some

\* Stephens' English Constitution, Vol. I, p. 304.

† For instance, have not the Canons of 1603, been repeatedly adjudged not to bind the Laity, because Parliament never sanctioned them? And has not Parliament repealed some of them, without any concurrent action of the Clergy in Convocation?

anomalies and some contradictions in the course of her labors, before a final result was reached. But, let us remember, these anomalies and contradictions are not the grounds on which the final result is to be considered, nor the tests by which it is to be tried. For instance, the fact that provisional Conventions sat in 1785 and 1786—without whose action by the way, the Mother Church would never have given us the Episcopacy—in which there were no Bishops, need not alarm us, so long as no *final action* was had, and no *authoritative* and *recognized conclusions* were reached, till the sitting of the fully constituted Synod of 1789. The fact that in 1785, it was *proposed* to make the Conventions of the Dioceses the Ecclesiastical Courts, and so to give the Laity a share in administering spiritual discipline, and the “power of the keys,” is nothing to the purpose, so long as the proposal was not adopted, and a totally opposite plan prevailed.

Neither were the provisions made by us for Lay representation, regarded as giving to the Laity any greater rights or powers than they possessed in the Mother Church. In a contemporaneous pamphlet, it was stated, that the power of the Laity represented either by Parliament or the Sovereign was greater in England than among us: and it was generally believed, that such was the case. The power of the King to annul the spiritual sentence of a Bishop's Court, his power to restrain Convocation, the fact, that to all intents and purposes, the freedom of the election of Bishops was nullified in his favor, and the further fact that such enormous powers in matters ecclesiastical were in the hands of Parliament, where *laymen alone* could carry any measure they chose in the very teeth of the Episcopacy—a thing which in our Church could never occur—were cited as proofs that not only was the power of the Laity not increased among us, but that it was even abridged; and that thereby, things were restored to a more just balance and equality.

We claim, therefore, to have shown upon sufficient grounds, that not only did we not suppose any new principle unknown in the Church of England to have been adopted by us in 1789, but also that no new principle was adopted; and that all which was undertaken or done, was to provide, under the new circumstances in which we were placed, for the carrying out a principle inherited from the Mother Church. Now, undoubtedly, the form which that provision assumed, was determined—we will not say was forced upon us—by the circumstances in which we were placed. And while we are not disposed to magnify ourselves, we cannot but say freely and plain-

ly, that in comparing the modes of working out the principle adopted respectively by the Mother Church and our own, and especially taking into view their several results, we can hardly regard ourselves as losers. With us, an Episcopal election is a reality; the Laity do not interfere, and have no wish to interfere, in the administration of discipline; they cannot make, and they have never shown a wish to make, the slightest change in our established order, without the concurrent action of the Episcopate and the Presbyterate; no change can be effected without the sanction of the Episcopacy; and while the acting Lay Synod of the Church of England is to-day composed of Papists, Infidels, and representatives of every species of Dissent, none but laymen in full communion—and that by an act of their own origination—can sit in the Lower House of our highest Synod. While therefore we deny the charge of having introduced a new principle in our Lay representation, we do not shrink from a comparison of our system and its results, with that adopted in the Mother Church.

We ought to say, in conclusion, that we have not called the attention of our readers to the subjects just discussed, because we regard Dr. Pusey as a safe exponent of the doctrines of the Church of England, or even as representing a large body of her members. But charges like his, touch our position as a Church; they cast dishonor on the memories of men whose names, unknown as they may be to Dr. Pusey, we venerate and love; they give them and us, considering their and our professed intentions, only the choice between deep dishonesty, or still deeper ignorance; and doing this, no matter from whom they come, they compel us, either silently to acknowledge them, or plainly to deny them. We—in common with others—have denied them. We believe that our denial has been sustained. And we will merely add the expression of our regret, that one who has always, even amidst the insults of the Papal Aggression, deprecated harsh language towards the Tridentine Church, should have used expressions towards his brethren of the same “household of faith,” in which the semblance of apology only heightens the severity of reproach.

## ART. II.—ST. PETER NEVER BISHOP OF ROME.

1. *Epistola Clementis Romani ad Corinthios*. Tubingae : 1842. 8vo., pp. 269.
2. *Epistolae Sancti Ignatii*. Tubingae : 1842. 8vo., pp. 269.
3. *Clementis Alexandrini Opera Græce et Latine Quae extant*. DANIEL HEINSIUS, Rec. etc. Lugduni Batavorum : 1616. Folio, pp. 580.
4. *Sancti Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera*. Parisiis : 1636. Folio, pp. 516.
5. *Sancti Irenaei Opera*. Ed. Erasmi. Basileae : 1534. pp. 335.
6. *Sancti Cypriani Opera*. Ed. Erasmi. Basileae : 1540. pp. 527.
7. *Firmiani Lactantii Opera*. Lipsiae : 1842, 1844.
8. *Qu. Sept. Flor. Tertulliani Opera*. Lipsiae : 1839.

It will be recollected by some of our readers, that the late Rev. Dr. JARVIS, in a series of Articles in the *Church Review*, in 1848-9, on the "Primacy of St. Peter," stated incidentally, but distinctly, that "there is no proof that he (St. Peter) was ever Bishop of Rome." This primary position in the Romish controversy, we are continually losing sight of. When, therefore, the Papists shall have proved, first, that there was a Primacy vested in St. Peter over the other Apostles; next, that this Primacy amounted to an actual Supremacy; then, that this Supremacy was to be perpetuated, in unbroken lineal succession; and finally that this Succession was to be kept up in connection with some one particular See;—neither of which fundamental points have they ever yet been able to prove—we say, that even then, they have only begun to approach the real difficulties of the subject. For it still would remain, to prove that St. Peter was ever Bishop of the Church of Rome. Those unstable souls among us, therefore, who, for whatever reason, are tempted to sunder their allegiance to our own true branch of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, should be made to understand, that there are still several serious questions to be met, before they can dare



attach themselves to the Roman Communion. To the following, which is designed as a popular, but yet pretty full historical argument on this question, we now invite the reader's attention. It will be borne in mind, that the monstrous corruptions and usurpations of the Modern Church of Rome, by which from her Trentine Council onward, she has forfeited her Catholic character, are not here mainly considered. That is another and distinct aspect of the whole question, which would still have to be attended to, even if our present argument could be shown to be a fallacy.

The authorities on which the Church of Rome relies, pretend not only that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome or Pope of Rome, but that he was so for a period of twenty-five years, and not only this, but that he was previously Bishop or Pope of Antioch for the space of seven years. Since these propositions are made the basis of sweeping claims and demands upon the Church, and yet since they are advanced by the Church of Rome as facts, and as historical facts too, we propose to make them the subject of investigation.

In respect to the Church of Antioch, we waive the examination here. We have carefully sifted every particle of evidence advanced, and have come to the conclusion, that whatever else St. Peter might have been, he certainly never was Bishop of the Church of Antioch. But there is no necessity of giving the details of this evidence here. We come at once to the main subject of our discussion, and to the proof that St. Peter was not the founder nor the first Bishop of the Church of Rome. We propose first to examine the testimony of the Earlier Fathers, and then the authority on which the Romanists mainly rest. The Sacred Scriptures, which are not silent as to the history of St. Peter, give us no reason to believe that St. Peter ever was at Rome at all ; but they do tell us that his appointed labors lay in another direction. The early Fathers, so far as they make any mention of St. Peter in connection with Rome, tell us that St. Peter, as well as St. Paul, preached the Gospel, and planted the Church at Rome ; and that both suffered martyrdom there, and at the same time. *The Fathers of the three First Centuries* always speak of these two Apostles as being closely connected, both in their labors and their sufferings at Rome ; and as both going there together, not long before their martyrdom, and in the time of the reign of Nero. But the writers of the *Fourth and succeeding Centuries*, while they often invalidate their own testimony, yet usually separate the two Apostles. They represent St. Peter as going to Rome alone, as early as the reign of Claudius



and for the purpose of withstanding Simon Magus, who was there doing great mischief by his magic. How this story of Simon Magus was exploded by the discovery of the monument to the Sabine Hercules Sanguis, dug up in A. D. 1574, and the subsequent rejection of the huge pile of Romish traditions, connected with it, we have no room here to show. These later writers, who grow more particular, the farther they are in time from the facts, also at length begin to associate a primacy with St. Peter, having made him to be for twenty-five years the Head of the Church at Rome, and indeed its first Bishop.

There is another introductory and important remark which we wish here to make. We are most carefully to distinguish between the Fathers as Witnesses of Facts, and as the Authors of mere Opinions.\* For no sooner had Christianity begun to make conquests in the domain of Philosophy—a Philosophy, too, occupied with questions on the deepest mysteries of man—than speculations sprang up on every side, both foreign to, and subversive of, the simplicity of the Faith. Nor should we forget, that as early as A. D. 335, the orthodox ATHANASIUS was deprived of his Office by a Council at Tyre, and banished to Gaul; while, in the same year, a numerous Council at Jerusalem admitted the Arians to the communion of the Church.† The opinions of many of the Fathers, so called, of that age, on the nature of the Church, its Ministry, &c., are equally unworthy of confidence.

The Fathers of the first Three Centuries appear to have attached importance to the history of St. Peter's and St. Paul's residence at Rome, mainly as it afforded them a convenient and unanswerable argument against the Heretics of their times. And as those Heretics rejected the authority of the Holy Scriptures, just as Heretics reject them now, so the orthodox confronted them, in the same manner as we confront them in these latter days; that is, by the testimony of those Churches which were instructed by the Apostles themselves. Hence the Church of Rome, having been taught by St. Paul, and very possibly by St. Peter also, was a fit example for their purpose, and they of course made the most they could of the traditionary account of the labors of both Apostles in that Church for this purpose. For we are never to forget the unfathomable gap which, in point of authority, separates the

---

\* See Church Review, Vol. IV, No. 4, Art. I.—“The Value of the Christian Fathers.”

† See Murdock's Mosheim, Vol. I, p. 239.

*strictly Apostolic* from the *strictly post-Apostolic Age*. And many of the very strongest expressions of the post-Apostolic writers, especially of the third and fourth centuries, respecting individual Apostles, have really nothing at all to do with the service into which Romish writers now press them. One needs first to swallow Popery bodily before he can find a particle of it as early as the fourth century. He cannot find it in the three first Centuries, nor in the Holy Scriptures, even then. And we here re-affirm the position which we advanced years ago,\* that if the Christian world is ever again to be restored to Unity, it will not be upon the basis of the so-called "Evangelical Alliance," a basis of *un-Primitive negations*; nor upon the Romish basis of *anti-Primitive affirmations*; but upon the basis of NICENE CHRISTIANITY; in other words, the Church must come back, in Doctrine, Ministry, Discipline, and Worship, to the model of the First Three Centuries; an age of martyrdom, of purity, and of glory. Besides this basis, there is no other possible. For it is the only true and fair expression of the Church, as she came forth from the hands of Apostolic and inspired men; and inspired for this very end to lay the "foundation" of the Church according to Christ's instructions.†

Let us now examine the testimony of the Early Fathers, as to the life and history of St. Peter.

In the latter part of the First Century, Clement, Bishop of Rome, speaks of St. Paul and St. Peter as persecuted and dying as Martyrs; but he does not say where, nor when.‡

In the middle of the Second Century, Justin Martyr speaks of Simon Magus, his magic, and his deification at Rome; but makes no mention of St. Peter's going to Rome to combat him. Nor does any other Father, until after the year A. D. 300.

About twenty years after Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, wrote his Five Books against the Heretics, in which he confutes them in the way before mentioned. The following extract will illustrate the method of his argument, and shows what he knew of St. Peter's being at Rome. He says:

"The doctrine preached, to all the world, by the Apostles, is now found in the Church; as all may see if they are willing to learn:—and we are able to name the persons whom the Apostles constituted the Bishops of Churches; and their successors down to our times; who have never taught or known any such doctrine as the heretics advance. Now if the Apostles had been acquainted with (certain) recondite

\* See Church Review, Vol. VI, No. 3, Art. I—"Religion for the Republic."

† Acts i, 3.

‡ Ep. I, ad Cor. § 5.

mysteries, which they taught privately and only to such as were the most perfect, they would certainly have taught them to those men, to whom they committed the care of the Churches; for they required them to be very perfect, and blameless in all things, whom they made their successors and substitutes in Office; because if these conducted aright, great advantage would result; but if they should go wrong, immense evils would ensue.

"But as it would be tedious in the present work, to enumerate the successors in all the Churches, I will mention but one, viz, the greatest, most ancient, and well known by all, the Church founded and established at Rome, by the two most glorious Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul. The faith of this Church was the result of Apostolic teaching, and the same was everywhere preached; and it has come down to us through the succession of Bishops:—and by this example, we confound all those who in any manner, either from selfish views and vain glory, or from blindness to truth, and erroneous belief, hold forth false doctrine. For with this Church, on account of its superior preëminence, every other Church, that is, those everywhere who are faithful, must agree; *because in it has ever been preserved, the doctrine derived immediately from the Apostles, and which was everywhere propagated.* The blessed Apostles, having founded and instructed this Church, committed the Episcopacy of it to Linus, who is mentioned by St. Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy. Anaclelus succeeded Linus, and after him, the third Bishop from the Apostles was Clement; who saw the Apostles themselves, and conferred with them, while their preaching and instructions were still sounding in his ears."

Irenæus thus enumerates the succeeding Bishops down to Eleutherius, "who" (he says) "is now the twelfth Bishop from the Apostles.\*" In the preceding section, Irenæus tells us, that Matthew wrote his Gospel while St. Peter and St. Paul were preaching and founding the Church at Rome.

Here is full and explicit testimony that St. Paul and St. Peter unitedly preached and founded the Church at Rome; and that they constituted Linus the first Bishop there. The language excludes both St. Peter and St. Paul, and excludes both equally, from the Episcopal chair of Rome. "They committed the Episcopacy to Linus; who was the first Bishop, and Clement was the third, and Eleutherius the twelfth."

Contemporary with Irenæus, was Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth. In reply to a monitory letter from the Romish Church, of which Eusebius† has preserved an extract, Dionysius says: "By this, your excellent admonition, you have united in one, the planting by St. Peter and St. Paul of the Romans and Corinthians. For both of them coming to our

---

\* Lib. III, Cap. 3.

† H. E. II, 25

Corinth, planted and instructed us; and in like manner going to Italy, together often teaching there, they suffered martyrdom at the same time." From this testimony, we may learn how and when St. Peter went to Rome; as well as what relation he sustained to the Church there. He and St. Paul came to Corinth together; and when they had regulated and instructed that Church, they went on together to Italy, and did the same things at Rome, as before at Corinth.

Now this, if true, must have been after the captivity of St. Paul at Rome, mentioned in the book of Acts. For St. Paul never went directly from Corinth to Rome, before that captivity. For he never was at Rome before he was carried there a prisoner in the year A. D. 62. But if released in the year A. D. 64, he might have visited Corinth afterwards with St. Peter; and then have traveled with him to Rome. To the Church of Rome, St. Peter and St. Paul, according to this testimony, sustained one and the same relation; and that was the same they had sustained to the Church of Corinth; viz: that of Apostolic teachers and founders—not that of ordinary Bishops. That is, St. Peter was no more the Bishop of Rome than St. Paul was; and neither of them any more the Bishop of Rome, than both were the Bishops of Corinth. Dionysius likewise here affirms, that St. Peter and St. Paul suffered martyrdom "at the same time;" and probably at Rome, where they had taught. That Rome was the place, is proved by Caius, a Romish ecclesiastic of the third century, as quoted by Eusebius,\* "I am able (says he) to show the trophies [the sepulchres] of the Apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican, or along the Via Ostia, you will find the trophies of those who established this Church."

The next Father, Clement of Alexandria, about A. D. 200, reports it as tradition, that St. Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome, while St. Peter was preaching there.†

In the first part of the Third Century lived Tertullian, a fervid and learned writer. He assailed the Heretics with the same argument as Irenæus did.

"Run over (says he) the Apostolic Churches in which the chairs of Apostles still preside in their places, and in which the Autographs of their Epistles are still read. If you are near to Italy, you have Rome as witness for us. And how blessed a Church is that, on which Apostles poured out their whole doctrine, together with their blood!—where St. Peter equaled our Lord in his mode of suffering; and where St. Paul was crowned with the exit of John Baptist."‡

---

\* H. E. II, 25.

† Euseb. H. E. VI, 14.

‡ D<sup>e</sup> Praescript. c. 36.

In another work he says: "Let us see what the Romans held forth; to whom St. Peter and St. Paul imparted the Gospel, sealed with their own blood."\* Again he says: "Neither is there a disparity between those whom St. John baptized in the Jordan, and St. Peter in the Tiber."† He moreover testifies, that St. Peter suffered in the reign of Nero,‡ and that this Apostle ordained Clement, Bishop of Rome.§

In the middle of the Third Century, Cyprian of Carthage, writing to the Bishop of Rome,|| calls the Church of Rome the principal Church; and that where "St. Peter's chair" was, and "whose faith was derived from Apostolic teaching." Tertullian had used similar language as to the "chair" of St. Paul also.

In the end of the Third Century, or beginning of the Fourth, Lactantius¶ speaks of "St. Peter and St. Paul" as having wrought miracles and uttered predictions at Rome; and describes their prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem. And in his work, on the "Deaths of Persecutors," (ch. 2,) he says:

"During the reign of Nero, St. Peter came to Rome; and having wrought several miracles by the power of God, which rested on him, he converted many to righteousness, and erected a faithful and abiding temple for God. This became known to Nero; who, learning that multitudes, not only at Rome, but in all other places, were abandoning idolatry, and embracing the new religion,—and being hurried on to all sorts of cruelty, by his brutal tyranny, set himself, the first of all, to destroy this religion, and to persecute the servants of God. So he ordered St. Peter to be crucified, and St. Paul to be beheaded."

We have now detailed every important testimony which we can find in the genuine works of the Fathers, in the three first centuries. The witnesses agree very well. They make St. Peter and St. Paul to go from Corinth to Rome in company, during the reign of Nero; and, after preaching and strengthening the Church of Rome, and ordaining Linus to be its first Bishop, both suffering martyrdom, at Rome, on the same day, St. Peter being crucified, and St. Paul decapitated. THERE IS NO REPRESENTATION OF ST. PETER'S BEING ANY MORE BISHOP OF ROME, THAN ST. PAUL WAS; AND IRENÆUS, IN PARTICULAR, EXPRESSLY MAKES LINUS THE FIRST BISHOP, AND TO BE ORDAINED BY THE TWO APOSTLES. This fact of itself, the absence of all proof of St. Peter's sole headship of the Church of Rome, and the positive proof to the contrary in the Writers of the first

\* Adv. Marcion, L. IV, c. 5.

§ De Praescript. c. 32.

† De Baptismo.

|| Ep. 55, ad Cornelium.

‡ Scorpiace, c. 15.

¶ Instit. L. IV. c. 21.

Three Centuries, together with the clear testimony of the New Testament, which we shall presently notice, settles at once and forever this whole question. If St. Peter, near the close of his life, and after St. Paul had preached there for two whole years, visited Rome, preached there and suffered martyrdom there, his stay in that city must have been exceedingly short; for St. Paul, in an Epistle written near the close of his life, certainly shows that St. Peter was not there then.\* Still, if he was there at all, this may help to explain the use which writers of a later age make of his name in connection with the Church in that city. But as to his possessing the headship of that Church, or being its first Bishop, the writers of the First Three Centuries know nothing of it. And surely writers later than the First Three Centuries are not to be trusted as witnesses of facts in Apostolic times; facts before unheard of; facts evidently made up to suit an emergency. At best, those writers are the authors of mere Opinions; and of opinions there was no lack either in variety, absurdity, and, as we have seen in the treatment of Athanasius, in impiety. There is no question that a certain *theory* of Church Unity began to be held and taught as early as the third century; and yet, even Cyprian rests the claims of the Church of Rome on its *secular* greatness; for he says: "plainly on account of its magnitude Rome ought to precede Carthage."† And the Romish Historian, Fleury, acknowledges that Unity was not attained by this theory; for it led to the great schism of the Oriental Churches. And that same theory, sensuous, worldly, unscriptural, impracticable, as it is, could not now, even if it were true, accept the Bishop of Rome as the centre of Unity; for the flagrant heresies of that Church render it impossible. But the theory itself is a false one.

We now come to Eusebius, who wrote about A. D. 325. The work which we now have bearing his name was not his, but is in the words of George *Syncellus*, a Chronographer of the Eighth or Ninth Century. The original Greek of Eusebius unfortunately has been lost. The work of his, which we now have, invaluable as it is, abounds in inconsistencies and contradictions, as we might easily show, and as the Romanists acknowledge. In his *Chronicon*, occurs the following passage, which is the only testimony that we need examine, as it is that on which later writers mainly rely.

He says:

"Anno secundo Claudii, Petrus Apostolus, cum primum

---

\* 2 Tim. iv, 10, 11.

† Cyprian's Ep. ad Corn., p. 70.



Antiochenam fundasset ecclesiam, Romam pergit; ibique vigintiquinque annos cathedram tenet episcopalem." This might be deemed conclusive evidence on the question, but it is so in appearance only. It proves too much, and will not sustain the weight sought to be imposed upon it. In other words, it possesses in itself the elements of its own overthrow—*mole ruit suâ*. And this is not difficult of demonstration. It is asserted above, that St. Peter went to Rome in the second year of Claudius. Now, this is utterly disproved by the fact that earlier authors do not place his journey to Rome earlier than the reign of Nero, and by the additional fact, that we find him two years later a prisoner at Jerusalem, at the instance of Herod Agrippa, (Acts xii.) Nay, more, we again find him still at Jerusalem at the Apostolic Council, held, as is generally chronicled, in the year 52, (Acts xv.) It is, therefore, simply impossible that St. Peter could have preached the Gospel and established his "chair" at Rome in the second year of Claudius; unless, indeed, he could have been at two places,—Jerusalem and Rome,—at one and the same time.

We are aware that some modern Romanist authorities dispose of this awkward *alibi* by telling us that St. Peter visited Rome twice—on the first occasion, in the second year of Claudius; which we have seen is disproved by his being found several years after that date in Jerusalem; on the second, under Nero,—year not specified. "By this double sojourn of St. Peter at Rome," says the historian Doellenger, "the ancient account may be explained, according to which he occupied the Episcopal See of Rome twenty-five years." Nothing is more easy, in order to maintain a groundless theory, than to suppose, and even to say, that St. Peter visited Rome on two occasions. But since the basis of the theory is overthrown, we must reject the superstructure so ingeniously and industriously reared upon it.

But let us, for a moment, compare this testimony of Eusebius with other testimony supplied to us by Eusebius himself. He states, as we have just seen, that St. Peter established his Episcopate at Rome in the second year of the Emperor Claudius, and was Bishop there for twenty-five years—that is to say, from the year 42 to 67. Now, he elsewhere informs us of the labors of some of the Apostles, as well as of the field of their laboring, and, in this number of the Apostles, St. Peter is included by name. He says,—“The holy Apostles and Disciples of our Lord and Saviour being scattered over all the world, preached the Gospel. To Thomas, as it has been handed down to us by those who preceded us, Parthia was allotted.

Andrew repaired to Scythia, John to Asia. But Peter is supposed to have preached through Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia, to the dispersed Jews : Who also at last coming to Rome, was crucified with his head downward.”\*

Now, this is totally at variance with what we have just been told of St. Peter's twenty-five years' Episcopate at Rome. Which, then, of these two conflicting versions, as furnished by Eusebius, carries with it the greater degree of probability? This question can only be determined by recourse to other witnesses, and among that number is St. Peter himself.

Among the last notices we have in Scripture of the Apostles, (such of them as still remained at Jerusalem,) previously to their setting out upon their respective missionary labors to preach the Gospel over all the world, as Eusebius in effect expresses it, is that supplied by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians,† and written from Rome. We there find the following account:—“And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.” From this authentic and decisive statement two conclusions are inevitable,—first, that St. Peter did not go and preach the Gospel to the heathen, either at Rome or elsewhere—and in the next place, and above all, that he neither was then, nor ever had been, Bishop of Rome—for it is incredible to suppose that St. Peter should have given the right hand of fellowship to St. Paul, in token of a solemn agreement between them, that he should go to the Circumcision, and St. Paul to the Gentiles, if he were already Bishop of Rome—the very heart, centre, and stronghold of heathenism ; and actually had been established there, as head of the universal Church, for ten or a dozen years. The true solution of the question is doubtless that furnished above by St. Paul, namely—that St. Peter's sphere of action, from the period in question, was among the Jews, (indeed it is expressly stated in the chapter under notice, ver. 7, that the Gospel of the Circumcision was committed to Peter,) and that hence, of the two conflicting statements of Eusebius, that which represents St. Peter as evangelizing the dispersed of his own nation is the true one—the other, investing him with an Episcopate of *twenty-five years* at Rome, consequently falls to the ground.

\* At Petrus per Pontum, Galatiam, Bithyniam, Cappadociam atque Asiam Judæis qui in dispersione erant predicasse existimatur. Qui ad extremum Romanus veniens crucifixus est, capite deorsum demisso.” Lib. III, cap. 1.

† Cap. II, 9.



If any corroboration were required of the fact as to which of these two statements of Eusebius is the correct one, we have it again from St. Peter, who addresses his Epistles to the Jews of those very countries mentioned by Eusebius as the supposed region of his labors: "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia." I Pet. i, 1. That the strangers here spoken of were Jewish converts, the Epistles themselves bear ample internal evidence. Many are the references we there meet with to the leading events of Jewish history, as, for example, to the Flood; no less than to some of its most prominent characters—as Noah, Abraham, &c., which would have been quite unmeaning, and out of place, had they been addressed to Gentiles, who did not believe in such things, if they had even ever heard of them before.

We have, therefore, the strongest evidence, as furnished by the two Apostles themselves, that St. Peter and St. James adhered to the agreement they had solemnly entered into with St. Paul and Barnabas, that the former should go unto the Circumcision—the latter to the heathen. This twenty-five years Episcopate of St. Peter at Rome, then, is shown by the testimony of Eusebius himself, as well as by that of the Apostles, to be utterly destitute of foundation.

That St. Peter, as Eusebius says, came to Rome towards the close of his life, ("ἐπὶ τέλος, ad extremum,") is not improbable. But if it were even the case, it does not prove that he was Bishop there—much less for the space of twenty-five years. On the contrary, Eusebius again informs us that *Linus*, not St. Peter, was the first Bishop of Rome. To the same effect is the testimony of Irenæus, who says: "The two most glorious Apostles (Peter and Paul) having founded and constituted the Church at Rome, committed the episcopate to Linus;" St. Paul being, according to Eusebius, equally with St. Peter, the founder of the Church at Rome; and neither of them being its first Bishop. So that St. Peter's individual headship over the Roman Church is disproved by the evidence of one who lived in the second century.

It is alleged, however, by the advocates of the Church of Rome, and by many besides, that St. Peter must have been Bishop of Rome, because his first Epistle contains the expression: "The Church that is at Babylon saluteth you." It is a striking fact that Romanists and Ultra-Protestants both agree in contending that by Babylon is here meant Rome; the former, in order to prove that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; the latter, to show that the threatenings denounced against Baby-

lon are to have their fulfillment in the destruction of the Papacy. That this Babylon was the city on the Tigris, that it was largely inhabited by Jews, and that St. Peter, near the close of his life, wrote and sent his first Epistle from that city, are facts as clearly established, as any other facts of history, as we shall presently show. This supposition that by Babylon is meant Rome, to say the least, is to accuse the Apostle of a *ruse* which is totally gratuitous and uncalled for. No consistent Roman Catholic can surely entertain a thought so unbecoming the Supreme Ruler of the universal Christian Church, and the "visible representative of the Redeemer himself upon earth." No, St. Peter, after the day of the Pentecost, was not the man, be the consequences what they might, to shrink from a frank avowal of his Divine Master, and thus virtually again to deny him. It is difficult to conceive what purpose this alleged deception could serve. It could not avail to the Apostle's personal safety, if that were the object; for had he been indeed at Rome, and that for the greater part of twenty-five years, as head of the Christian community even there, the emissaries neither of Claudius nor of Nero, can be supposed to have been hoodwinked by so shallow a device. To suppose that it was to avoid the consequences of his previous escape from "the power of Herod, and the expectation of the Jews" at Jerusalem, is unjustly to suppose that he had relinquished his trust in that Saviour to whom he confessedly owed such a mighty deliverance.

It is certain then, that these Epistles were not written at, or sent to Rome at all; but that the liberty taken with so plain a statement of the Apostle as that now under notice is liable to be considered in the same light in which a similar procedure on any other subject would be viewed—as a device, purposely designed, to connect St. Peter with the Church of Rome at all hazards!

It is worthy of remark, too, that these Epistles (the second in particular) were written shortly before the close of the Apostle's earthly career, for he says, (2d Pet. i, 13)—"I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance, knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me." If these Epistles, then, were really written at Rome, and towards the end of St. Peter's life, they must have been written nearly contemporaneously with those of St. Paul, (especially that of second Timothy) which were confessedly dated from Rome. But in the case of St. Paul, and so far as the Roman government was concerned, we hear of no neces-

sity for fictitious names. Where, then, is the ground of such necessity in the present instance? If St. Peter's letters had been seized by the Roman authorities, there was nothing treasonable in them,—not a syllable reflecting on the “powers that be.” On the contrary, he exhorts those whom he is addressing to “submit themselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake,—whether to the King as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. Honor all men, love the brotherhood, fear God, honor the King.” To present Christianity in this its genuine character was surely the most effectual way, not to provoke, but to disarm the opposition of its enemies. It is far more probable, therefore, that St. Peter meant what he said, than that he should have said what he did not mean—a doubtful expedient at any time, but much less likely to be chargeable against the Apostle on the grave occasion in question, when, as he says, he knew that he must shortly put off his earthly tabernacle.

But there is still stronger testimony as to the place where these Epistles purport to have been written—one which presents itself from the scene of the Apostle's labors, and which neither compromises his honesty, nor does violence to his express language. Josephus informs us\* “the Jews obtained honors from the Kings of Asia, when they became their auxiliaries; for Seleucus Nicator made them citizens in those cities which he built in Asia, and in Lower Syria, and in the metropolis, Antioch itself; and gave them privileges equal to those of the Macedonians and Greeks, who were the inhabitants, insomuch that these privileges continue to this very day.” We read again† as follows:—“When Hyrcanus (the last of the High Priests by succession, as Eusebius informs us)‡ was brought into Parthia, the King Phraates treated him after a very gentle manner, as having already learned of what an illustrious family he was; on which account he set him free from his bonds, and gave him a habitation at Babylon, where there were Jews in great numbers. These Jews honored Hyrcanus as their High Priest and King, as did all the Jewish nation that dwelt as far as Euphrates.” By the Babylon here mentioned we are not necessitated to understand the ruins of the ancient city of that name, but a then comparatively modern town built on the Tigris, in all probability, by Seleucus Nicator. Whiston remarks—“The city here called Babylon

\* Lib. xii, cap. 3.

† Lib. xv, 2.

‡ Lib. i, cap. 6.

by Josephus seems to be one which was built by some of the Seleucidæ upon the Tigris, which, long after the utter desolation of old Babylon, was commonly so called."

Now, when we consider that St. Peter's sphere of action lay in the East, including Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia, &c., we can have no difficulty in perceiving the propriety of his addressing the converts of those countries from Babylon; more especially as it appears to have been a place of note, as indicated by the King having, in consideration of Hyrcanus' illustrious family, given him a habitation there. And Josephus tells us, not only that "there were Jews in great numbers" in this Babylon, but also makes mention of "all the Jewish nation that dwelt as far as Euphrates." Benger, in his *Commentary* on St. Peter's Epistles, maintains that they were dated from a real Babylon, of which he says, that it swarmed with Jews.—(Scatebat Judæis.) In Pearson's posthumous works\* we meet with the following, as expressing his view of the question:—"Sed Babylone tunc fuit Petrus quando scripsit epistolam ad dispersionem Judæorum; tota enim argumenti vis ad illam literalem expositionem resolvitur." Lightfoot and Fulke are of the same opinion.

This view is strengthened by another consideration. We read, Acts ii, 5, and following verses, that, on the day of Pentecost, "there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven—Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, Libya about Cyrene, Cretes, Arabians," &c. We cannot doubt that there was in those regions a field amply large for the united energies of *all* the Apostles, and one that might well invite and engage the zeal of St. Peter, who, in fact, may be said to have commenced preaching the Gospel to those very people on the day of Pentecost; for he it was who, "standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice," and addressed this assembled multitude of strangers. The fruits of this discourse, we are told, were "about three thousand souls."

It is worthy of remark, too, and in the same line of argument, that at the commencement of his Epistles, St. Peter, in the enumeration of the regions to which they were addressed, makes mention *first* of Pontus; which was, indeed, most natural, supposing him to have written from Babylon, but the reverse if he wrote from Rome; because, whilst Pontus was comparatively near to Babylon, it was the most remote from

---

\* "De successione primorum Romæ episcoporum," cap. 7, (1688.)

Rome. And as St. Peter no doubt intended his Epistles for the instruction of all those Churches he had planted in the regions he successively visited, it is not likely, if he wrote from Rome, that he should have sent Silvanus, by whose hands the Epistles were conveyed, first of all to Pontus rather than to Bithynia. Much less is it probable, since the Epistles were addressed, *seriatim*, to the Churches of "Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," that Silvanus should have thought himself at liberty to reverse this order, and, by a circuitous route, make those Churches last which St. Peter had named first.

We hitherto discover no reasonable ground for believing that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years. But most abundant are the proofs which point to an opposite conclusion.

We now come to a still stronger portion of our argument. If St. Peter had exercised the Episcopate at Rome for so lengthened a period as is alleged, we might expect to find, if not positive proof of the fact, at least some reasonable traces of it in the concluding chapter of the book of Acts. We are there supplied with a minute account of St. Paul's arrival at Rome, together with some interesting particulars which accompanied it. St. Luke informs us, that when the brethren at Rome heard of St. Paul's arrival at Puteoli, and that he was on his way thence to the capital, they came to meet him as far as Appii Forum; and that when they reached the city, the centurion delivered up the prisoners to the captain of the guard, St. Paul being permitted to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him. The narrative proceeds to acquaint us that, "three days" after his arrival, Paul called the chief of the Jews together, and explained to them the reason of his having been delivered a prisoner into the hands of the Romans.

"For this cause," continues he, "have I called for you to see you, and to speak with you; because that for the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain. And they said unto him, we neither received letters out of Judea concerning thee, neither any of the brethren that came showed, or spake any harm of thee. *But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest, for as concerning this sect we know that everywhere it is spoken against.* And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging, to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets, from morning till evening. And some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not."

Now, from this plain statement it is evident that St. Peter could not have been Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, nor for any other period; for the *chief* of the Jews were still totally ignorant of the very rudiments of the Christian religion; in-

somuch that St. Paul was obliged to have recourse to first principles, to the hope of Israel, to the Law and the Prophets, just as he had occasion to do when called to plead before Felix and Agrippa. They knew, as they said, "that this sect was everywhere spoken against," and were, therefore, desirous of hearing St. Paul's opinion. That opinion, "concerning Jesus" and the "sect" so spoken against, he frankly gave them. The result was, that they agreed not among themselves; and when St. Paul declared to them that "the salvation of God was sent unto the Gentiles, and that they would hear it, they departed, and had great reasoning among themselves." *But the question naturally occurs, where was St. Peter all this time?* One would have naturally expected that he would have been among the first to go and welcome St. Paul, or, at any rate, that he would have called upon him at his "lodging." But this was not the case; nor do we find that it was ever so during the two whole years that St. Paul sojourned at Rome. But another question comes up, how did it happen that the chief of the Jews were so ill informed of the things "concerning Jesus," and their minds so little disabused of their prejudices concerning "this sect," if, as is alleged, St. Peter had by this time been nearly twenty years Bishop of Rome?—that St. Peter, we repeat, to whom was committed the Gospel of the Circumcision, and "in whom He that was mighty in St. Paul toward the Gentiles wrought effectually to the apostleship of the circumcision?" Can it be possible that St. Peter had never yet set foot in Rome? We find no evidence hitherto in Scripture which answers in the affirmative; while the facts in the case render such a supposition most impossible and absurd.

From the Acts, we proceed to St. Paul's Epistle to those very Romans whose Church St. Peter is said to have founded, and governed for so many years. This Epistle was written from Corinth, some three or four years before St. Paul's arrival in Rome, just mentioned; and it is certainly not too much to expect, if no proof positive of the fact of his Episcopate there, at least some remote allusion to it. At any rate, if St. Peter held such a position as our modern Papists delight to ascribe to him, as "Primate," "Lord High Vicegerent," "Vicar of Christ," "Prince of the Apostles," "Foundation of the Church," "Helper of the Faithful," "Chief Bishop of the Church Universal," "and "Lord High Keeper of the Keys of Heaven and Hell," we might at least expect to see some sort of allusion to him. On the contrary, and the argument is as strong as it can be, most strange to say, *not one word of*



*St. Peter, not so much as the mention of his name, is there to be found from beginning to end ;* and although nearly a whole chapter is devoted by St. Paul to the salutation of various individuals, *not the slightest recognition of St. Peter* is to be met with. Now, supposing, as some have done, that St. Peter was then absent from Rome on some important official duties, yet we cannot imagine that St. Paul, who was always averse to encroach "upon another man's labors," would take upon himself to exhort, direct, and warn the flock of St. Peter, "the head of the Universal Church," without so much as ever alluding to his name, any more than if he had never existed. The whole account argues, beyond question, an unconsciousness on the part of St. Paul that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome.

We find no evidence, then, of St. Peter's connection, either official or personal, with the Church of Rome, in the Epistle to the Romans, or in any other portion of Scripture. St. Paul was detained two years a prisoner at Rome, and during this period and during the period of his second captivity there, of which St. Luke makes no mention, he wrote his several Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and second Timothy. But in vain do we search for the slightest reference to St. Peter in any one of them. And what is more remarkable than all is, that St. Peter, in his own Epistles, one of them written near the close of his life, makes no more allusion to his relation to the Church of Rome as its governing head, much less of his supreme jurisdiction over all other Churches, than does St. James in his Epistle. From all this, in conjunction with his complete silence towards the Church of Rome, as evinced by his never having written to it one line during the whole of his alleged long absences, it is manifest that St. Peter was as ignorant that he had been its ruler, *par excellence*, as St. Paul appears to have been.

Had it been St. Peter instead of St. James, who was Primate at the First Council of the Church, Acts xv ; and had it been St. Peter, instead of St. Paul, who declared he had "the care of all the Churches," (second Cor. xi, 28,) we should never have heard the last of the Scriptural argument for St. Peter's Primacy. But now, there is not only the entire absence of any such Scriptural proof, but the clearest Scriptural testimony to facts which are irreconcilably opposed to any such primacy. Patristic testimony, as we have seen above, is equally explicit. That St. Paul, rather than St. Peter, was the first preacher, and the founder of the Church at Rome, the Scriptures plainly teach. If, at the very close of his life, St. Peter was

at Rome, and suffered martyrdom there, and preached there, this is all that is necessary to explain the writers of the first three centuries; still leaving St. Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles, as St. Peter was of the Circumcision. The title of "Universal Bishop," was first claimed, not for the Bishop of Rome, but for the Bishop of Constantinople; a title which St. Gregory, Bishop of Rome as late as A. D. 595, declared to be arrogant, wicked, schismatical, blasphemous, and anti-Christian; and which title was first assumed on the part of the Bishop of Rome, by Boniface III, the successor of Gregory, and from jealousy of Constantinople and of its Bishop, rather than as the successor of St. Peter.

We must not close the Scriptural argument without remarking, that St. JOHN, who lived thirty or forty years after the death of St. Peter, and who left behind him copious writings full of instruction and warning for the Church, not only does not recognize the slightest claim of precedence for St. Peter, or for the Church of Rome; but, on the contrary, he plainly denounces the judgments of Heaven against that Church, for those very abominations and idolatries which we now witness.\*

To extend this line of observations is unnecessary. We have seen that the evidence of some of the most celebrated authorities of antiquity—such, for instance, as Irenæus and Ignatius—are inconsistent with this claim on the part of the Church of Rome, that the weight of Eusebius's testimony falls into the other scale, and that Scripture decidedly gives it the negative.

But there is one aspect of our subject which concerns every Christian, and which, on that account, should not be passed over unnoticed. Neither content with this alleged twenty-five years' Episcopate of St. Peter at Rome, nor with the usurpation of universal dominion, the Church of Rome must needs make these things absolute conditions of salvation; and thus virtually proclaim another Gospel!

In her Canon Law, which is the exponent of her principles, she lays down, *inter alia*, the following points:—

"The Pope, by the Lord's appointment, is the successor of the blessed Apostle Peter, and holds the place of the Redeemer himself upon earth."†

"The Roman Pontiff bears the authority, not of a mere man, but of the true God upon earth."‡

\* Wordsworth on the Apocalypse. Phila., 1852.

† Gilbert's Expos. of the Canon Law, tom. ii, p. 6.

‡ Ib. p. 9.



“Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, gave to the Roman Pontiff, in the person of Peter, the plenitude of power.”\*

Upon these principles she has, consistently enough, established in her Douay Catechism (page 21) the following enunciation:—“He who is not in due connection with, and subordination to, the Pope and General Councils, must needs be dead, and cannot be accounted a member of the Church; since from the Pope and General Councils, under Christ, we have our spiritual life and motion as Christians.”

While in our own day we have seen the monstrous presumption of a Pope, unaided by a Council, attempting to fasten upon the Faith of Christendom as essential to salvation, a dogma which the best sentiment of the Romish Church has long since unequivocally condemned; and a dogma which is already becoming fruitful in the most heathenish idolatries.

Had St. Paul been aware of any such doctrines as are here propounded, how could he, with truth, have testified with such solemn emphasis to the rulers of the Church, whom he had expressly summoned from Ephesus,† “Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I have not shunned to declare unto you *all the counsel of God*,” when he had not declared to them one word about St. Peter, or the Papacy, much less that, if “they were not in due connection with, and subordination to, the Church of Rome, they were dead, and could not be accounted members of the Church,” and could not be saved.

Then, again, with respect to this supreme spiritual authority over all Christendom, alleged to be vested in the Pope of Rome, by inheritance from St. Peter, where was it, when St. Paul, Gal. ii, 11, withstood him to the face before all, in that very Antioch, the reputed scene of his pontifical chair? Where was it, when St. Peter addressed his Epistles to the Churches in the East, and styled himself by the self-same title that St. Paul adopts in all his Epistles—“Peter, *an apostle* of Jesus Christ?” Where was it, when Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, and Bishop of Smyrna, in the second century, successfully maintained his independence, and that of the Eastern Churches, before Anacletus, the second Bishop of Rome? Where was it, when Irenæus, also in the second century, successfully opposed Pope Victor, regarding the observance of Easter? Where, again, was it, when Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, in the middle of the third century, did not hesitate to censure Pope Stephen, on the question of heretical baptism?

\* Gilbert's Expos. of the Canon Law, tom. ii, p. 10.

† Acts xx, 26, 27.

The above instances may suffice to show that this alleged universal supremacy, as invested in the person of St. Peter, and descending from him to all the Popes of Rome, is an assumption that was unknown alike to St. Peter himself, to St. Paul, to Polycarp, Irenæus, and Cyprian. At what period it effectually crept into the Church there is no question, but it is unnecessary here to enquire. It is evidently an innovation, and is proved to be so by the old standard of the Church of Rome herself. It wants the "quod semper," the "quod ubique," the "quod ab omnibus;" and above, and before all, it wants that, without which even the other characteristics of its genuineness would be defective—it wants the *QUOD PRIMUM*. For, as Tertullian remarks, (*adver. Præx.*) "Id est verum quod primum, id est adulterum quod posterius." We arrive, then, at this incontrovertible conclusion, that St. Peter could not, by any known laws, bequeath that to his successors, even supposing the Popes of Rome to *be* such, which he did not possess himself—viz, the supremacy over the Universal Church.

It is of little consequence, except to herself, what interpretation the Church of Rome may attach to the power of "the keys," and to that of "binding and loosing," for we know that the same powers which were conferred by our Lord upon St. Peter at one time, were also conferred by Him upon all the Apostles at another.\* The Church of Rome, however, will have it that she is built, not upon the *grand truth* embodied in St. Peter's declaration—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," but upon St. Peter himself; thus placing herself in direct antagonism with the doctrine of St. Paul, who says to the Ephesians—"Ye are built upon the foundation of the *Apostles* and Prophets." And, again, "Other foundations can no man lay than that is laid, which is" (not St. Peter, but) "Christ Jesus." St. John, too, in the book of Revelations,† writing concerning the new Jerusalem, uses these singular expressions—"And the wall of the city had *twelve foundations*, and in them the names of the *twelve Apostles* of the Lamb."

What does St. Jerome say to these extravagant pretensions of the Popes of Rome?

He writes to Evagrius—"Wherever there is a Bishop, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tanis, his influence is the same, his Episcopal degree the same. The power of wealth and the lowliness of poverty make not a Bishop greater or less. But they

\* See St. Matthew, xviii, 18, and St. John, xx, 23.

† Chap. xxi, 14.

are all the successors of the Apostles.”\* No preference is here given to the Roman See—no superior jurisdiction assigned to the alleged successors of St. Peter. The Bishop of Rome and the Bishop of Tanis are spoken of as Bishops of coördinate authority. Anything beyond this, on the behalf of the Church of Rome, was accorded to her simply and solely as being the Church of, or in, the metropolis. And none know this better than well-informed Roman Catholics themselves. This was a principle well understood in the Primitive Church, and was applied not only to the Bishop of Rome, but also to the Bishops of the principal cities in the provinces. And the practice was deemed so expedient that the Council of Antioch, holden near the year 341, established, as a rule, that “the supreme ecclesiastical administration of the province should appertain to the Bishop of the civil metropolis, for this reason—that it was the place of the greatest resort.”† This privilege, however, which was conceded to the Church of Rome solely from her commanding political or temporal position, she has, by evoking the name of St. Peter, converted into a *divine right*, and thus, out of a mere local and conventional prerogative, forged her chains for the spiritual subjugation of the entire Christian world.

So utterly impossible is it, to sustain the claims of Modern Rome, either by Holy Scripture, or the Early Fathers, that not a few Romanists have yielded this point frankly. Brownson, of our own country, as appeared in an earlier Number of this Review, admits this. Newman, the English Apostate, does the same. One builds his argument on Authority; the other, on Development. Nor are these men alone. The celebrated Cardinal Nicholas de Cusa, Bishop of Brescia, says in his Treatise *de Concordia Catholica*, Book II, c. 13: “We say truly that all the Apostles were equal to Peter in power; moreover, it must be remembered, that in the beginning of the Church there was but one general Episcopate;” and in c. 34, of the same work, he asserts: “That the Roman Pontiff cannot be proved to be the perpetual Prince of the Church is sufficiently clear.”

The two famous professors at Salamanca, Dominic Soto and Dominic Bankes, express themselves to the following effect on this subject:

---

\* “Ubicumque fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopolis; sive Rhegii, sive Alexandria, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem episcopum non facit.”

† Doellinger, Vol. I, Chap. V.

"Whether the extreme point of dignity is *jure Divino* in the Roman Church, so that the Bishop of Rome and the Supreme Pontiff are joined in one by a Divine bond, is not so certain as some imagine."—Soto.

"Although it is believed to be true by very learned and Catholic men that the Roman Pontiff is *jure Divino*, the successor of Peter, it is nevertheless not the Catholic faith, but merely a very probable opinion."—Bankes.

The Church of Rome is no longer what she was in her pristine purity. She has departed from herself; and by relinquishing her claim to this—*quod primum, quod semper*—she has also forfeited her claim to the distinguishing appellation of Catholic and Apostolic, and unwittingly earned for herself the very epithet she so liberally bestows upon all who presume to differ from her, that of—HERETICAL.

We have now accomplished the task which we proposed, and the conclusion arrived at is, that proof is wanting that St. Peter founded the Church, either of Antioch or of Rome, and that Scripture negatives the assertion that he governed either the one or the other—much more for the space of seven years, and of twenty-five years respectively. That Linus was the first Bishop of Rome there can be no manner of doubt. That St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, there is not only not the slightest reason to believe, but, as we have seen, there is undoubted testimony which renders such a supposition an utter impossibility. The civil preëminence of the city, the growing power and gradual corruption of its Bishops, the falsification of genuine records, and the forgery of spurious ones as the Romanists themselves admit, the madness of perverse ambition, are enough to account for a pretension which we have endeavored briefly to expose. That there is a certain sense in which St. Peter may be spoken of as the first of Apostles, is readily granted. But that he had no official supremacy or jurisdiction over the other Apostles is most manifest; and it is also equally certain that he was not the head or first Bishop of the Church of Rome.

## ART. III.—THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY IN THE APOSTOLIC POSITION.

*Church Review, Volume X, No. III. Art. I.*

In the settlement of the Church by our Ecclesiastical Fathers, about whose brows still lingered the light of the Revolution, the natural (not ecclesial) limits of the first Dioceses were the old Colonial boundaries, as retained by each "State." The Thirteen Colonies readily offered Thirteen Dioceses. But two or three cities of any rank were then in existence, and some of the Dioceses had their population so dispersed over their wildernesses, that it seemed far more appropriate then to give a Bishop the charge of a State than seat him at a small town (though the largest) at one extremity of it. In reality our early Bishops were territorial Missionary Bishops; and the fact was recognized by the title conferred upon them.

At the time, too, of this inauguration of the State-diocese System by the Fathers of the cis-Atlantic American Church, there were but two or three Bishops. The little Church must have had more faith than the Church retains to-day, (which easily despairs if it see not present results,) to have foreseen that this vast Continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, would, within a century, become divided into States and demanding Diocesan Sees! France or Spain held then vast portions now embraced by several Southern and Western Dioceses. The unparalleled march of the Republic over these foreign domains, and the rapidity with which new States have been added to the original Thirteen for which they legislated, could not have been foreseen by the Patriarchs of the American Church. If they had anticipated this enlargement of Empire, which we to-day behold, they would have perceived that cities would rise in all parts of the new States, and that their increasing population, their hundreds of towns, would demand a division of Dioceses, not by *halving* them as is done in New York, (leaving in fact *no* Diocese of New York!)\* or quartering them, and, by and by, if the State of New York increases in population as it has done, octupling the Dioceses in the State! In

\* The Bishop of New York is not, in truth, what his title declares him to be, otherwise, what becomes of Bishop DeLancey? This confusion and inconsistency will go on increasing, unless the system be exchanged for the "old paths."

a century this State will demand eight Sees, to oversee its thousand towns filled with people!

No one will deny this. Suppose the Diocese, by and by, to be thus quartered and octated:

RT. REV. BP. ———, DIOCESE OF SOUTHERN NEW YORK.

RT. REV. BP. ———, DIOCESE OF N. W. NEW YORK.

RT. REV. BP. ———, DIOCESE QUINTUPLE NEW YORK.

RT. REV. BP. ———, DIOCESE SEXTUPLE NEW YORK.

RT. REV. BP. ———, DIOCESE SEPTUPLE NEW YORK.

RT. REV. BP. ———, DIOCESE OCTUPLE NEW YORK.

So on with Pennsylvania and Ohio, and the other Dioceses. It will not be denied that this is the inevitable tendency of the present system of territorial Bishops, who are nothing more nor less, *de facto*, than Missionary Bishops, as well knows every one of these our Prelates of the American Church, notwithstanding their large and stately titles; for they have no SEES! They are *Episcopi in partibus infidelium*!

Without doubt our reverend and venerated Fathers, in the post-Revolutionary day, had no dream of Steamboats and of Railroads which were to take the place of deep rivers and build up towns and cities in remote interiors of the Continent, far beyond tidal waters, and crowd the great Dioceses with many rival metropolitan cities. We will not say, in departing from the Seedilic System, they were short-sighted. Without Steam, a thousand years would have been required to achieve the grand results which we now behold in the extension, population, and vastness of the Republic. Without controversy the old way, by which we mean the *oldest* way, is the best, in Church affairs; for what is new, *is new*!

The able writer of the "Article," in the October Church Review, which has drawn from us these present remarks, has very truthfully and fairly stated that the introduction of territorial Dioceses is a novelty, and *peculiar* to the American Church; and by his examples has deduced proof of the fact. What would be the condition of England, if the first Bishop had been Bishop of Britain? or if subsequent Sees had been limited by the geographical boundaries of the Heptarchy? i. e. Bishop of South Saxony? Bishop of Middle Saxony? Bishop of East Saxony? Bishop of West Saxony? and also Bishop of Northumbria? As the Gospel extended, there would have been no room for subsequent territorial Sees, if Sees they can be called, which have no *Sedilia*.\* The

---

\* The Cathedral feature is not essential to a See! The *seat* should be a chief city, but not of necessity contain an Episcopal Throne!—(Cathedra.)

present harmony, and completeness, and total fitness of the Diocesan System in England, is due to adherence to the Apostolic practice. Each See being in a city, as it ought to be according to the Apostolic and most ancient custom of the Church Catholic, the Sees are capable of being increased with the founding of new cities and centres of population and influence for all time to come. It is a simple system, aside from its being the true one, and works without confusion or entanglement; while that of the cis-Atlantic Daughter Church has already begun to produce confusion, which is to increase more and more. For example, vide "The Diocese of New York," and "The Diocese of Western New York;" which is of course an amusing contradiction, to say nothing severer; for either Bishop Potter, "of New York," ignores, whensoever he recognizes his own Diocesan title, the jurisdiction of the Bishop of "Western New York;" or Bishop DeLancey usurps (we beg his pardon!) that portion of the Diocese of the former, which is called indefinitely "Western New York!"

How do people get along in this confusion? Why, in this way! When I address myself to the Rt. Rev. Bishop of New York, I do it with a simultaneous *mental reservation* that I do not mean he is Bishop of *all* New York, as I desire also to pay due respect to a certain jurisdiction claimed by Bishop DeLancey! but I say, in my thoughts, "By Bishop of New York," I mean really only "of *half* of New York!"

It is to be hoped that the Church in General Convention will put an end to such grave absurdity, and, by a unanimous vote, restore to the Church the Sees which she does not now possess, except as "The shadow of a name;" and enable her to grow with the Republic, increasing her Sees with the increase of her cities. This Missionary System (which it only is) now obtaining in the Church, and pregnant, if it continue, with great disorder in the settlement of Episcopal jurisdiction, will no longer answer. The Church is the Body of Christ. In its Diocesan corporeality this body needs a *heart*. This is supplied by the Civic\* See.

As the Body Ecclesiastic at present is constituted Episcopally, there is no Heart! *no* centre of life, no system of circulation. There is life and blood, but their activity is feeble and resultless, sluggishly circulating through an unwieldy mass, instead of a symmetrical form. Centralization, by erecting Sees in the chief Cities, is the only mode which the Church can

\* We make use of the word "civic" instead of Metropolitan; as the latter term belongs properly to the Capital City, which in New York would be Albany: civic is therefore the general term.



adopt to secure the results she aims at through her Episcopacy. The question, 'How shall we make the Episcopacy effectual to compass the ends for which it was, in the beginning, divinely instituted?' has come up. The answer unquestionably is, by returning to the equally Divine mode of operation ordained of Christ, and inaugurated by His Apostles, "who knew the mind of Christ" in making Jerusalem (not Judea) the See of the first Bishoprick; and subsequently made Smyrna and Ephesus, and Alexandria and Byzantium give the Episcopal titles, and not Asia Minor, Eastern Greece and Egypt; and so on through all the Sees. The three hundred and seventeen or eighteen Bishops at the Council of Nice, were titled after cities, not after kingdoms, states and territories. So it has been throughout the Church from the beginning, and in all ages. The Bishop of Rome is no more than a metropolitan title, for Italia was the name of the empire, not Roma; and to that city and the ancient subjacent Diocese, is really limited that Prelate's jurisdiction. The Anglican Bishops, as well as the Gallic Bishops, are surtitled upon cities. If the French Bishops were Diocesans of the Departments of France, they would then have a system somewhat analogous with our own anomalous one! The writer of the Article to which we allude, "THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY IN THE APOSTOLIC POSITION," is right. Our Bishops should receive their titles from the chief cities; and we have no doubt that the voice of all intelligent laymen in the Church, as well as of the clergy, and a large majority of her Prelates, are of this mind. The Article alluded to should convince any man that the American Church stands alone in this territorial Missionary Diocesan System, and has committed an error by legalizing it, and is perpetuating the error by practicing it. Why, we have no Episcopal Sees! Some good Churchmen talk of Cathedrals! Where shall we put a *Cathedral* in any one of our Dioceses? For instance, a Cathedral has been talked about at Baltimore. There can be no *Cathedra* in Dioceses where there are no sedilia; and there can be no sedilia where no chief city gives name to the See. A Cathedral in New York, or Baltimore, would be an absurdity under the present system of *mobile* Sees, which being supposed to be "in omnibus partibus," are nowhere in particular!

We have said quite enough upon this part of the subject for ingenuous minds; and now, we devote a few thoughts to the serious evils which the present unwieldy and inefficient system contends with. The Bishops are quite unable to compass Dioceses that are larger than many ancient kingdoms! They cannot faithfully work the immense and impossible field

in which the Church's Diocesan custom has placed them. It is like working a steamship with an engine for a small river-boat; like placing a gardener to work single-handed a whole plantation. *All* the Bishops have either the evils to contend with of too much territory or of too much people. They are unable to perform the Herculean tasks set them; and of course do not perform them. The Apostles could not have done the work which the American Church expects her Bishops, the Apostles' Successors, to do, under her present unwieldy leviathan system. Look, for example, at the field over which the Venerable Bishop Kemper exercises jurisdiction; and for the prosperity of the Church in which, he is held responsible. Minnesota, larger than all Great Britain; Kansas, as large as Great Britain; and Wisconsin, only a fraction less than all England and Wales; each of these immense territories capable of sustaining a denser population than that of England; each filling up with cities and towns with a rapidity unparalleled in the history of the world—and yet this whole vast field committed to the charge of one single man; and that too, so far as the Church is concerned, at the most critical and turning point of its history. And yet, Churchmen, and calling themselves very strong Churchmen too, refused a Bishop to Kansas at our last General Convention by the merest piece of ecclesiastical jugglery. To work this field with anything like thoroughness, there ought to be, at least, five Bishops on the ground at once. And five such men *as the work calls for*, would almost from the outset draw nearly their whole support from the field itself; and would establish CHRIST's blessed Church throughout that entire region.

So also in Iowa, Alabama and Tennessee, it is territory sparsely settled now, but rapidly filling up, that lifts up the same cry for fields reduced to possible working. Tennessee is divided by ranges of mountains into three geographical divisions, called East, Middle, and West Tennessee. Each of these has a chief city, viz, Knoxville in East, Nashville in Middle, and Memphis in West Tennessee. These cities are, in round numbers, 200 miles each from the other. At present, the excellent and laborious Bishop resides at Memphis, five hundred miles from Knoxville! For twenty years this noble Prelate has been toiling till his hair is gray and his health broken, to till and subdue to the Church this vast empire! No man could do it. And no successive Bishops for a century hence can compass the work. Twenty other "Bishops of Empires" are contending against this evil of "too much largeness." They fly from town to town almost like post-riders, and are unable to give but a few days to each place, perhaps only an

hour or two. Their faces are hardly known to their vast Dioceses! They confirm and preach, and hurry on, to preach and confirm! They are, in one sense, "angels of the Churches," for their visits to them "are few and far between." We know that in some of the Western Dioceses there are considerable towns in which there is a Church, the Rector of which has not for two years seen his Bishop, and is unable to do so from his being occupied in over-work, elsewhere in some *terra incognita ultima Thule* of his vast Ecclesiastical realm.

Of course, the Church in these overgrown Dioceses suffers; and no wonder that the Reports to Conventions show such meagre increase, either in the ministry or of the people. The Bishop of Mississippi, in a letter to us, says that "he has been with his family," (a large family too, and one of them an invalid,) "but seven weeks of the year out of the fifty-two;" being for the rest of the time on horseback, or on the road traveling his Diocese a thousand leagues, *without* the seven league boots, with which he ought in justice and mercy to be provided. Turn to the interesting Addresses, painful ones, too, when we reflect upon the inadequate results which are reached by such vast labors and such great expenditures of time, and such noble sacrifice of all personal ease, and of social and family amenities; turn to the Reports of those hard-working men of God, (having beside the care of all the Churches,) and see if they should not with more propriety be termed "JOURNEYINGS," for they are chiefly narratives of endless journeys "by flood and field." Read therein with marvel of their four and six thousand of annual miles, not by rail or steam, but chiefly in the saddle or springless wagons; and, peradventure, on foot!

Perhaps it may be said St. Paul traveled much more and farther! True; and if it be admitted, (as would seem to be the case,) that our Bishops of the great Western Empire Dioceses are sent out to preach to the *whole earth*, as St. Paul was, we abandon of course our present ground; but as they are not supposed to be Missionary Bishops, but Diocesan, we are disposed to pursue the subject further.

The Church in these Dioceses does not make herself felt: She falls short of her mission, and is of necessity a stranger almost everywhere except in some twenty-five or thirty points, where feebly her light shines.\* If the Episcopacy be, as it unquestionably is, the pioneer of the Church System, if the true principle of aggression, (converting the world,) be that

---

\* See Journals of Conventions of some twelve or fourteen of these mammoth Dioceses.

the Bishop is the legitimate founder of new Churches, and that *sine Episcopo nulla Ecclesia* is as true of planting parishes as framing Dioceses, the Bishops *per se* have not yet in the American Church had a fair chance, to make use of an expressive Americanism. The Episcopal Office is absolutely bound in chains by the present system. The Bishops weary themselves out in attempting to do what cannot be done. The Episcopal idea in the Ancient Church never contemplated Bishops of Empires. The discrepancy between the vast machinery and the inadequate results that follow this show of power and display of dominion stares the Church in the face! We are all wrong, and it is no indignity to take the retrorse to the prior period whereat we took the wrong path, and come into the old path again.

We reiterate, the American Episcopate is a great, unwieldly, unmanageable "concern," as our Methodist brethren would say; for to the harmony and unity of a system it has no claim. Our Bishops are of necessity a sort of Ecclesiastical, Imperial magnates, who govern vast States in Sword's Pocket Almanac, but never (and never to do it) in reality. We respect our Bishops, but they do not and cannot do justice to themselves and to the inherent powers which exist in the Episcopate for building up the Church and evangelizing the waste places of the earth! Church folk respect the Bishop; but yet they think somehow, that if it were not for the Confirmations and Ordinations to be performed by *their* hands, the Church could do very well without them. People who think so, are of the class who imagine that before a Bishop goes *anywhere*, he must have intimation that there are already Parishes and Church people existing to go to. These people forget, or do not know, that one of the peculiar acts of the Office of a Bishop is to plant the Church, to make disciples for Christ, and gather about him Clergy and laity. It is not the Church people who are to find out a Bishop; but the Bishop who goes to a people who are not Church people, to plant the Cross and the Church among them. To wait till towns "are large enough," and Christians numerous enough in it, before a Bishop goes to it, is doing the Church's work inversely; beginning altogether at the wrong end.

But this fact is so patent that we need not enlarge upon it. Admit it, and we ought at this moment to have a Bishop in every large city. If a Presbyter can be supported in Brooklyn, Rochester, Knoxville, Nashville, and Memphis, so can a Bishop, for it costs no more. Place then a Bishop in each of those cities, or in a city where there is no Presbyter, and let

that city be his titular See, and let him begin there the work of his *pastoral* Office! The spider would catch few flies, if he sat at the extremity of his web. The *central* power of the Episcopate must first be *seated* firmly, and all the rest, Clergy and laity, will follow in their proper order.

By this re-distribution of the country into smaller Dioceses we accomplish another important end. We avoid, to a great extent, the possible, and more than possible, evils of an unfortunate election to the Episcopate. How Bishops ought to be elected, is one question. Whether the English method does, or does not, lift the election above the influence of party and personal ends, more than our own, is another question. We are happy in the belief that the elections, of late years, and especially in our older Dioceses, have been felt as a rebuke to party wire-pullers, and we believe they will prove so more and more. Underhanded influences may contribute now and then, to carry an election on strictly party grounds for some distant outpost of the Church; but the temper of the Church is becoming more and more intolerant of such tactics. And yet, with all the care and wisdom possible, an unfortunate election to the Episcopate may take place; and with this, there are interests periled, and risks run, and injuries received, greater than the Church can afford. The GREAT HEAD of the Church never designed that so much should be ventured on such an experiment. And, even if the risk could be ventured in England with more safety, where the order of things is firmly established; where there are various ranks of inferior Clergy, Archdeacons, and Chancellors, and Canons, and Prebendaries, to break the force of the blow before it reaches the great body of the Church, there is no such intervening power here.

And yet, how great the risk is! We have Dioceses growing up in fifty years from a population of forty-five thousand to a population of over two millions; and filled with towns and cities, springing up as by enchantment from nothing, to the size of ten, twenty, fifty, and a hundred thousand people. There are Dioceses, too, where schism and heresy have already gone to seed; where infidelity is rife; where the old Platforms have fallen to pieces; where the better portion of the people are in just the condition to receive the Church, if she were only faithfully and fairly presented. And yet the interests of CHRIST's kingdom over this vast territory and among this immense population, are all risked on a single man, and that man, unfortunately, proves a failure. The Church loses what she can never regain. These twenty, thirty, or forty years,

have been fatal to the Church for all time. Thus, one Bishop may be physically disqualified for much active duty, and yet not in a condition to demand or ask for a Suffragan. Another, may be by nature inactive and inefficient. Another, may be constitutionally timid, lacking the native power to lead on his Church in a great movement. Another, may be a man of mark as a man of letters, of learning and intellect, and in the quiet of his study, he may scent out all sorts of heresies, and write very orthodox Pastorals; and meanwhile Infidelity and vice, and irreligion, are stalking rampant over his Diocese. Another, with all his splendid gifts and talents, may yet lack the most essential gift of all, a knowledge of human nature. Another, has proved unequal to the temptation of his Office, and is puffed up with swelling vanity and worldly pride. Another, misled by a spurious liberality, fails to present the Church in her integrity, fraternizes with, and gives the moral weight of his name and influence to all sorts of humanitarian agents and devices; and so the Church, Samson-like, is shorn of her strength in the lap of this modern Delilah. All these things are possible. And the bare possibility ought to be guarded against now, as the Apostolic Church guarded against it.

The remedy for all these possible, and more than possible evils, is to come at once back to Scriptural and Primitive example. Nothing is simpler or easier. Suppose, then, that the cities of ALBANY, ROCHESTER, BUFFALO, BROOKLYN, (with Long Island as its diocese,) and NEW YORK CITY, with Staten Island as its diocese, were, by the next General Convention, made Episcopal Sees, the limits of each defined by the same power. What an impetus would be given to the Church! How it would loom up among the powers of the land! With five more centres of consolidation, of strength and of expansion, it would be five times multiplied in the time in which, under the present arrangement, it would be doubled. And so in all the Dioceses.

Let us now see how some of these Sees with their Bishops would look on paper; inasmuch as we have shown the possible appearance of the quintuplet and sextuplet Diocese.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Galveston, Texas.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Austin, Texas.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop of New Orleans, La.\*

The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Baton Rouge, La.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Natchez.\*

---

\* We confess that the R. C. Bishops, wiser than "we children of light," have secured a seat in these SEES; for with all her errors, herein the Church of Rome holds to the Apostolic customs. But there is room for us!

- The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Jackson.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Memphis.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Nashville.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Knoxville.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Savannah.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishops of Portland and Augusta.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishops of Concord and Portsmouth.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishops of Hartford, New Haven, Middletown,  
 New London and Bridgeport.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishops of Philadelphia, Harrisburg and Pitts-  
 burg.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishops of Cincinnati, Columbus and Cleve-  
 land.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishops of Richmond, Norfolk and Lynch-  
 burg.  
 The Rt. Rev. Bishops of Baltimore and Annapolis.\*  
 The smaller Dioceses should remain *in statu ante*—as those  
 of Delaware, Rhode Island, and perhaps that of New Hamp-  
 shire and that of Vermont.  
 NEW JERSEY should have two Sees, viz, Newark and Bur-  
 lington.  
 SOUTH CAROLINA two—Charleston and Columbia.  
 ALABAMA three—Mobile, Montgomery and Tuscaloosa.  
 FLORIDA two—Tallahassee and St. Augustine. †  
 NORTH CAROLINA two—Raleigh and Wilmington.  
 KENTUCKY two—Frankfort or Louisville and Paducah.  
 ILLINOIS three—Springfield, Chicago and Galena.  
 MISSOURI two—St. Louis and Independence.  
 INDIANA two—Indianapolis and Madison.  
 WISCONSIN two—Milwaukie and Delafield.  
 ARKANSAS two—Little Rock and Van Buren.  
 CALIFORNIA two—San Francisco and Sacramento.

The above will be, with some few substitutions, perhaps, of other names, the *seats* of the new SEES, under the proposed restoration of the "Apostolic Ministry to the Apostolic Position." A reference to the map will show that some of the places are at extremities of States, and face, or lie adjacent to, large portions of other States which are remote from any large

\* Washington City, with the District of Columbia, should be erected into a separate See. Its chief Church should be under the pastoral charge of the Bishop of Washington, assisted by his Clergy. It should have no preëminence founded upon locality; Episcopal preëminence alone should follow the law of seniority in consecration.

† The geographical position of Pensacola, as well as its commercial and social relations, would naturally attach it to the See of Mobile, it being but forty miles distant.



town, or possible See, in those States. In such cases, the See should embrace the portion convenient to it within its ecclesiastical jurisdiction; for in the proposed plan the State bounds cease to define and limit the jurisdiction of the Church's Bishops; for what has the Church to do at all with political lines of territorial separation, when she exists wholly independent of the accidents of State? Suppose two States should be permitted by Congress to unite under one government, what would become of the two Dioceses? Neither would exist. The Church should not risk such contingencies, which, not probable, are yet possible. Or suppose a State divided into two States; to which will the Diocesan belong. Will he, like the Colossus astride the harbor of Rhodes, attempt to stand on both? State linear bounds should not influence those of the Church; for the Gospel comes not to forests but to peoples; and this State Diocesan System does not keep pace with the people as the country fills up, and cannot do so, but expends itself in ceaselessly traversing vast forests thinly settled, because they are, forsooth, within "the diocese." Abandon the present inefficient system, and the Episcopate will be free to follow the people and occupy towns; and, unbound from only State limits, can reach over into other States where souls are, and there build up the Church.

For illustration, look at Mobile! As a See, it could embrace Pensacola, the inhabitants of which have petitioned more than once to be separated from Florida and attached to Alabama, to which by geographical position, it belongs. The inhabitants in East Mississippi, far away from their Bishop, who resides at Jackson, and who are within sixty miles of Tuscaloosa, have hitherto desired to be attached to the Diocese of Alabama, its Bishop then residing at Tuscaloosa. Natchez\* in Mississippi, as a See, (with Louisiana opposite on the other side of the Mississippi river,) could embrace a section of North Louisiana, in which there is no large town; † St. Louis as a See, a portion of Illinois within forty miles. Montgomery could embrace a destitute portion of Western Georgia. Other similar cases will readily occur to the reader.

What is wanted is a *sensible* subdivision of the jurisdiction of our Bishops, a division based upon population more or less concentrated, not upon (as at present) numbers of acres, or leagues of State dominion. And this plan must so commend

---

\* Vide map.

† The Bishop of Louisiana comes three hundred miles to visit Concordia opposite Natchez, in which city the Bishop of Mississippi used to reside.

itself to every Churchman who reads the Article in the October Review,\* that it requires no prophet to foresee that now this important subject is fairly before the Church, the plan will become a law ere many years.

But what are the objections with which this system will have to contend?

First of all, and greatest of all in the eye of some, will be the expense of supporting these numerous Sees. But this is all imagination. It is a notion associated with the cost of supporting English Sees with their feudal grandeur, their princely incomes and palatial residences. It is a figment without any reality. It will cost no more to support a Bishop in the cities named above, than it does the leading clergymen in each city. The only question is, "Shall the Sees be created?" The new Bishops are, *per se* parish ministers! Let them be supported *as* such, in the beginning. For instance, suppose that the Rev. Dr. — of Buffalo, the Rev. Dr. — of Albany, the Rev. Mr. — of Rochester, the Rev. Dr. — of Brooklyn, (the Rt. Rev. Bishop of New York remaining in statu quo, and with his present title,) were to be elected Bishops to these Sees, what increase to their salaries need there be? Of all the large cities let there be Sees created, and a presbyter therein, or from elsewhere, consecrated therein and therefor, the city giving him his title; the Convention (General) fixing the bounds of his Diocese. A Bishop's marketing and house-rent cost no more than a Presbyter's. The question of expense does not therefore enter into the subject at all; while the Church would be the gainer by the elevation to her Episcopate of some forty men, men of learning, piety, and talents, each the centre of Dioceses which they can compass and take hold of all around, and of which they can thoroughly work all portions; Dioceses, in short, of possibility, not of impossibility.

There is another objection which may be urged, growing out of a reluctance to alter what the Fathers of the Church have left sealed with their seal. In matters of doctrine, to alter is to destroy. But this is not a question of doctrine; but simply of legislation. The boundaries of our Dioceses were not set by Inspiration, but by human authority and in Council. Laws, by their very nature, are liable to repeal, when the circumstances under which they were rendered expedient are changed, or no longer exist. It was once decreed by legislation in Congress, that the District of Columbia should consist of an area ten

---

\* The reader is referred to this Article, which will shortly be issued in pamphlet form.

miles square, and embrace the cities of Washington, Georgetown and Alexandria. After half a century this law was repealed, and a new law set Alexandria off again to Virginia, reducing the Federal area several square miles; nor has the Republic of the United States been shaken or at all disturbed in its integrity by this excision and change of the boundaries of her imperial three and a third leagues square. We have no doubt the Church, acting in a matter equally open to legislation, would remain firmly upon her old foundations.

There will, perhaps, arise another objection. It will possibly come from the existing Prelates of our present Dioceses, who may object to seeing their great territorial Dioceses dwindling to such comparatively small limits. When our territorial Bishops visit England with its little Benjaminic Dioceses encircling their venerable Sees, the Anglican Prelates not unlikely note the contrast, when they look at their trans-Atlantic brother's Diocese across the water—on the map! and compare their own with them. But suppose the question, "Where is your See?" were put to one of the American Diocesans? He would be in as great a dilemma as the Methodist "Bishop" Simpson, at the late great Evangelical Council in Prussia, when the venerable King asked him, on his presentation, "Where is your See?" "I have none." The monarch, then probably recollecting *we* had Dioceses in the American Anglican Church which had no Sees, inquired again, "Where is your Diocese?" "I have none, your majesty." The King looked amazed, when the "Methodist Prelate" answered, "I am a Bishop at large." Just what our Bishops are—"Bishops at large;" only a line drawn by the United States Government Surveyors, confining them within certain finite portions of the United States. Possibly, then, there will be a strong opposition from some of the Bishops of the Church, though we have no sufficient reason for thinking so, and perhaps we do them injustice to anticipate it on such ground. And yet we remember that Bishops are men, after all; and there is a certain sense of dignity in the idea (it is only an idea) of being Bishops of a State! It looks imposing. But looks are very deceptive. Let us look at one out of eleven Dioceses, the clergy of any one of which do not reach thirty-six men, and the communicants numbering from twelve hundred to three thousand; while the population of the Diocese is reckoned by hundreds of thousands! Does *this* look like being a Bishop of a State? If, indeed, we were to go into an examination of this question of population, we should have at once the strongest possible exposition of the utter impracticability, and the specious un-

reality of our present Diocesan System. It is the substance that the Church wants, not shadows. A leaf of an oak is of more value than the whole tree's shadow, though it cover an acre of ground. No judicious Prelate, convinced that something must be done by legislation, and that soon, for the better division of Dioceses than the octuple system, will oppose the return to the Apostolic mode, from any apprehension of losing position, or diminishing the respectability of his mitre. What the Church needs, and what we are persuaded she will have, is Bishops who shall be indeed Shepherds of souls. Nor will we leave this part of our subject without adding, that there are Bishops of the Church, and Bishops who would be personally affected by such a distribution of Dioceses, to an extent second to none, who will be heard from, when this subject comes up, in words of truth and soberness. The question will override all petty lines of party; and it occupies to-day, as we know, a large place in the thoughts of many of the wisest and best men among us.

When the Church shall have adopted this as her working system, in ten years' time she will astonish the Republic by her vigor, power, expansion, vitality and universality. Truly Catholic then, she will be found where she is not now; and she will be almost at once stronger in our great cities, than she can be in a century in the present system of *waiting for Dioceses to grow up to the Bishop!*

It may be objected, that, under the proposed system, the number of Bishops would be greatly increased. Of course it would. But what of that as an objection? If our present Diocesan arrangement had obtained in the days of Constantine, instead of 318 Bishops being present at the Nicæan Council, there would not have been seventy-five! The number in the House of Bishops will not, however, of necessity, immediately be increased. The Bishops of the new Sees, like our missionary Bishops, may have no seat in General Convention\* until the Clergy attached to each See reaches a certain number, to be fixed by the General Convention, say twenty-five, which is about the mean of the number of clergy belonging now to more than half the Dioceses. This number, as the population increased and the Clergy in the same ratio, might be extended by legislation to fifty, or other number; in the same manner in which Congress from time to time extends the figures which fix the number of thousands of citizens that are entitled to a Representative.

---

\* See Article, Oct. No. Church Review, on this feature.

There are other considerations suggested by this important subject. There is much more ground to go over before it can be fully presented to the minds of Churchmen. Thus an objection may arise with regard to Diocesan Conventions. Must they cease to exist, or be modified? Not at all. They might still retain as their ecclesiastical jurisdiction the limits of the old Diocese, embracing the Clergy of *all* the Sees within it, and be presided over by the Bishop of the oldest See; which in the State of New York would of course be that of the city of New York. Hence no existing Bishop in the whole Church will lose either position or authority, either in Convention, or in the House of Bishops, by voting for the restoration. Indeed we cannot conceive of one well grounded objection to the proposed change. The greatest difficulty in its way, we apprehend, will be that dead inertia which fails to grapple with a great principle, merely because it costs an effort.

What we have written has been rather to show the practical workings of the proposed system, than to discuss the principle itself. This has already been done in the Article before alluded to, and in a manner to carry with it the force of a demonstration to many thoughtful minds. The subject is before the Church, and it will not be suffered to sleep. The evils it seeks to remedy are too glaring to be ignored. We trust the mind of the Church will be fully prepared to see a movement in our next General Convention toward a restoration of the Church to the Old Paths, and to replace "THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY IN THE APOSTOLIC POSITION."

## ART. IV.—ENGLISH CHURCH WORK.

A SOMEWHAT familiar acquaintance with English Polite Literature for a lifetime; and with the affairs of that venerable Church for more than forty years, constitutes just such a preparation for a summer's sojourn upon that beautiful and grand old Island of the Northern Seas, as exalts it at once into one of the richest intellectual treats, and one of the most delightful religious privileges, which can be enjoyed by any descendant of her exiled sons. To enjoy it is one thing; to describe it in such a manner as to impart to others some share of the same exquisite enjoyment, is a very difficult matter. Besides the attempt is everywhere surrounded by peculiar delicacies. It would be treating a highly interested public very badly, to serve them up a dish of dry and barren generalities, when the very thing it wants is something individual, illustrative and spicy. On the other hand the danger is imminent, when catering for such a taste, of intruding within the charmed and sacred circle of social and domestic life. The vigorous pen, even of an Emerson, barely escapes from dullness and tedious repetition, from declining too much on one side of this delicate line; and the lighter pen of hardly a single American tourist, whether clerical or lay, has been wholly exempt from the opposite fault.

The present writer is somewhat protected from the danger of falling into either of these dangers, partly by the sobriety which befits an Article prepared expressly for a dignified Quarterly, but chiefly by the narrow limits which place effectual restraints upon mere gossip.

But this slight effort is attended by further difficulties; the necessities of a prodigious condensation on the one hand, and yet the consciousness of very limited observation, and still more limited knowledge on the other, suggesting and provoking explanations and comments, all along, whilst yet the consciousness is most profound, that nothing could be less reliable than general results, deduced from such very limited induction. Under all these embarrassments and limitations, we now propound our method, which is, under quite a variety of heads, to give light and familiar narrative illustrations, endeavoring most scrupulously to keep within the limits of strict social proprieties, and frankly avowing our impressions, fully aware that if held and expressed with becoming diffidence, they

will be scanned with becoming candor ; and, in any event, will be sure to exert no more influence than they really are entitled to.

**CHURCH EXTENSION.**—The first eye-glance, on each side of a long railroad ride, in a country so highly cultivated as England, marks an era in a traveling life ; but when the eye of that traveler for more than a quarter of a century has been annually accustomed to cast such a glance over the newer and rougher portions of a southwestern American landscape, some idea may be formed of the emphasis with which he exclaimed, "How delightful it is at last, to be permitted to visit a country that is finished!" The very cuts of the railway, smoothly graded and covered with the brightest green sward ; and the humblest station house adorned with its creepers, its standard roses, and its neat and tasteful flower garden !

But the clerical eye found its chief delight in the number and simple beauty of the rural and village churches, never absent, and nowhere neglected ! To all former experience, the contrast how great !—the very ancient in place of the very new ; substantial stone instead of perishable frame, or rude logs ; and one for the entire population, (apparently) and therefore adequate and dignified, instead of the many, and not one of them at all dignified or suited to the purposes of public worship. No one had felt the curse of the sub-division of sects more sensibly, for years ; and to none could the absence of this one of its evils, have been more pleasing. To his practiced eye the implication was instantaneous ; here we probably have one, educated, resident and permanent minister, well supported, instead of half a dozen transient ministers, not half sustained. As we approached the great Metropolis, the number of entirely new churches rapidly increased ; and through all its suburbs, such indications were even more cheering.

Our impression of Denmark and Sweden, and of other countries where the Protestant religion predominates, and is the religion of the State, without knowing much about it, is, that they remain pretty much where the Church of England was at the opening of the last century, and in the age of Queen Anne, in possession of the old churches, erected under the old regime, without any sensible improvement as to renovation or repairs ; and no increase at all as to numbers. Church authorities, lay patrons, and the people themselves, have remained almost as dormant as the grand old foundery of these ancient shrines ; and entirely satisfied if they did not actually tumble down about their ears ! It may be a rough estimate, but can-



not be far from the mark, that the population of England had doubled, before its church accommodations had increased one-tenth. The great excuse for the Northern Protestant nations, is found in this, that their rural population has not sensibly increased; and this much can most truly be affirmed, that as many new churches have been built there since the Reformation, as in any Roman Catholic country.

But no Government, undertaking a monopoly of the religion of the country, has ever yet met an extraordinary demand for clergy, churches and schools, any better than an extraordinary demand for salt, or bread-stuffs, of which it may unfortunately have held the monopoly. It is a little more remiss in supplying spiritual than physical wants, that is all. Should the demand be prodigious, if not met by private and voluntary enterprise, it will not be met at all.

It would be curious to look into the statistics of Church Extension in Queen Anne's reign, for the purpose of instituting a comparison with the far more remarkable efforts which have been made within this century, and particularly within the last twenty years. Compared with the increase of population, and the means furnished by Government, outside of the resources of the Church itself, it is believed that the advantage will be found largely on the side of the more recent measures; and in round numbers, we have somewhere seen the estimate, that more than two thousand churches have been added over the whole country, inclusive of not less than two hundred in London alone, more, it is said, than all the erections put together the whole three hundred years, since the Reformation. Our own observation brought us acquainted with specimens of the best efforts, in every line of direction. Cathedral restorations and ornamentation upon the most liberal and gigantic scale, and often at a cost equal to the erection of an entirely new Church, vastly better fitted to the purposes of Christian Worship than the grand old structures originally erected for far other purposes, for those of processional and scenic worship, whose claims have long since been superseded by those of a more spiritual and acceptable service. And yet, what man of cultivated taste would wish one fraction of all this munificence deducted as far as it has been wisely expended? They are monuments of an exalted genius, perhaps of a devoted, though mistaken piety; let them stand forever!

Grand old Parish Churches, too large for profitable use, most thoroughly restored and beautified, Redcliffe, Bristol, Bath Abbey, St. Botolph's, Boston, and the noble old Norman Church at Rumsey. The venerable Chapel at Lambeth, where

seventy years ago, the link was moulded which united our line of Bishops with a succession not less illustrious than any which has come down to us from the Apostles' times, has been well restored. How swelled our heart, when uprose the image of the good old Bishop White, as we had known him, and we tried in vain to realize how he must have looked and felt when he knelt and prayed, on that very spot just before us! We could far more easily recall the overpowering emotion which accompanied the laying on of his venerable hands, when another, in a far distant land, had received the same high and solemn commission!

"So may the bright Succession run  
Through all the courses of the sun,  
Till unborn Churches by their care,  
Shall rise and flourish, large and fair."

To this end, nothing is wanting but greater, wiser, better men, each successive generation, until the millennial period is brought back into perfect harmony with the Apostolic! And our God can and will raise them up!

But we were intending to say, that, besides the restoration of the Chapel of the Archbishopal Palace, many of the Bishops had been at great expense in removing the incrustations of paint and whitewash, with which barbaric modern hands had concealed the more sober and solid ornaments of a better age of art, in their private Chapels. The most magnificent, but as it seemed to us, the least wise of all the expenditures which we noticed in the way of Church extension, was one of the most perfectly and wonderfully beautiful, that of Mr. SYDNEY HERBERT, at Wilton. Such Romanesque is even more gorgeous than the most highly ornamented Gothic; and the way in which some of the rarest gems of ancient art are interwoven into this new and most beautiful structure, excites the highest admiration. Nor was our own taste particularly offended by the presence of some few indications that in the gratification of antiquarian fancies, no small hazard was run, of doing violence to that stern old vein of Protestant plainness, verging even to roughness, which dictated the maxim, "the nearer to Rome, the further from God!" The main objection in our own mind was this: by an outlay of one-half, or one-third, a more practical Church could have been built, in severer, but far better taste. But, through all that region, but especially amid the Potteries of the Diocese of Lichfield, most of the restorations, and all the New Churches which we inspected, were wise and practical, in an eminent degree.

This Article would prove interminable, if to every sub-di-

vision as large a space were to be given as to this, which must therefore at once be brought to a close, by two of the groupings which first fell under our own observation. It was a special gratification that our first Sunday in England was passed in Islington; and the first preacher on the Lord's Day that we heard was the venerable Archbishop of Canterbury, in what, not many years ago, was the pulpit of the present venerated and beloved Archbishop of Calcutta. The Vicar had asked of the Primate the sanction of his great name for one of his benevolent parochial projects in connection with the education of the poor. And it would be exceedingly difficult to determine which was most to be admired, the scriptural fullness and simplicity of the teaching, the unaffected humility of the great and good man, or the irrepressible demonstration of regard and reverence with which thousands of the poor welcomed his coming and honored his departure.

All this in passing. The point before us, the statement on the part of the Vicar, the Rev. DANIEL WILSON, son of the Archbishop of Calcutta, with regard to Church Extension within the limits of his own cure. We cannot vouch for the precise accuracy of the statistics—our memory may have failed—nor, indeed, is it very material; the proportions did not vary much from the following: When he became Vicar of St. Mary's, the Parish Church of Islington, upon the elevation of his honored Father to the Episcopate, some twenty-five or thirty years ago, a population of 12 or 13,000 was very inadequately supplied with one Church, served by the Vicar and three Curates. The population has increased to 116,000, the Churches have been multiplied to twenty-five, and within the bounds of the Parish there are now fifty Clergymen; and the indefatigable Vicar has on foot a plan to raise \$150,000 for the erection of ten more Churches! Of those already erected, some are of iron and some of frame—various, and some of them successful expedients to meet, at once, a pressing want, until a more permanent church can be built.

It will be proper to state, that in the number of Clergy, the Instructors are included of the School of the Church Missionary Society for the training of Foreign Missionaries, which is in Islington, and the officers of various Charities, and other supernumeraries. But, in whatever light regarded, we have here, within the limits of a large Parish, what in America would be a large and vigorous Diocese; and, mainly, it has depended as much upon voluntary enterprise as any similar efforts on our part in Boston, New York, or Philadelphia. The question is, has it not reached more of the poor, and does

it not bear a larger proportion to the rapid increase of population? This, surely, is Church work, well done.

About two months later, we spent a few days at Leeds, and received a statement only a little less remarkable, from its able and indefatigable Vicar, the Rev. Dr. Hook. Twenty years ago, he entered upon that vast and arduous field, with a rapidly increasing population of some 30 or 40,000 under his charge, aided by five Curates. Within his parochial boundaries, there are now more than 160,000 persons. Meantime, twenty-one new churches have been erected, the Parish Church rebuilt upon a very grand and magnificent scale, and work found for twenty-five clergymen. For seventeen successive years, a church each year was added to the previous number. Not in this connection can we mention the efforts made for education; or the indications which we witnessed of the love and veneration of all classes of the operatives for their untiring friend and benefactor.

**INCREASE OF CLERGY.**—The Church Edifices of an Establishment are one of its inert and dead elements, liable to few and slow fluctuations; whilst the ebb and flow in the supply of a living ministry is subject to far more remarkable changes. One would have thought that two such grand and magnificent Institutions as Oxford and Cambridge, founded and splendidly endowed in the ancient times expressly for the perennial supply of an highly educated clergy, and still flourishing in all the plenitude of their strength and resources, would have proved through all time more than adequate to the supply of any increased demand. Many causes have combined to bring about a very different result. Of old, to rear an educated Clergy, was to meet nearly all the demands made upon the educated classes, for legislators, lawyers, and authors, nearly all belonged to the clerical ranks, or had been drawn from them; and as to most of the Nobility and the Commanders of the Army and Navy, the cultivation of thew and muscle was far more highly esteemed than skill in eloquence or in dialectics. Humanity and the country were incalculably the gainers, when in the course of human events and of social progress, the Universities came to be gradually transformed from Theological Schools for the few, into Classical Schools for the many; and the duty was devolved upon them of imparting a profound elementary training, lying deep at the foundation of all the liberal professions, instead of elaborate specific culture for the sacred Office. After the experiment of ages, we have small reason, upon the whole, to regret this transformation,

when we look at the present condition of Saragossa, of the Sorbonne, and of St. Omer, and contrast the influence which their Alumni have impressed, through the Clergy alone, upon Spain, France, Europe and the world, with that of the Alumni of the English Universities in all the various departments of life.

That the Church, meantime, should suffer much was to have been expected; that she did not suffer more is doubtless owing under God, to an undying Church-life in every branch of the Church blessed with an open Bible, the Ancient Creeds and a Scriptural Liturgy. Indeed, as far as numbers alone were concerned, or a larger share of sound theological training than elsewhere was to be found within the bounds of Protestant Christendom, the change of the Universities almost entirely into classical and mathematical Schools does not appear to have operated very disastrously. The decay was rather in earnestness and in piety. To the revival of these, dating back to the early part of the last century through a long line of earnest men down to our own times, are we to trace those wonderful changes and the rise of all those Schools, whose influence in the increase of the number of the Clergy, and above all in their more thorough training for their appropriate work, everywhere fell under our admiring observation.

We were present at the Commemoration of the Training School for the Clergy, at the very door of the Episcopal Palace at Cuddesdon, and were witness of the enthusiasm with which a large assembly of the gentry and clergy, at a public dinner, under a tent upon the lawn of the Palace, listened to a glowing eulogium, in the absence of the Bishop of Oxford, upon that distinguished Prelate, on the part of Mr. Gladstone; and in which the courage, the independence and the fearlessness, amounting, under the circumstances, to moral heroism, with which he had entered upon the establishment of a School for theological purposes alone, and in part for the benefit of those to whom a full University course had been denied, at the very doors of that great University itself, were largely dwelt upon and highly commended. In the comments which we afterwards heard, from heads of colleges and other distinguished clergymen from Oxford, we observed that some admitted, whilst others denied or greatly modified, the charge of neglect at Oxford of the proper theological training of candidates for Orders. That there has been a great change for the better, both there and at Cambridge, there is no room to doubt. This, indeed, is one of the largest collateral benefits which such Schools as that at Cuddesdon is bestowing upon the Church.

On another occasion, we were present in the chapel of the School for the Orphan Children of Missionaries, at Islington, on the occasion of the Addresses to sixteen Missionaries of the Church, previous to their departure to various and distant portions of the Missionary field, one half of whom were clergymen and a majority, we believe, from the Islington Training School, and had ample opportunity of judging of the solidity, simplicity and yet thoroughness of the material arrangements for the accommodation of these students; and have reason to believe that they are no less thorough for the acquisition of modern languages and sound theological learning; whilst with regard to the sacred and hallowed influences which preside not only over the studies of the young men, but over their very pleasures and their daily lives, there can be no doubt.

A great number of venerable and sacred associations, rendered a visit to St. Augustine's College, at Canterbury, even more interesting; and a sacred Sunday spent under the roof of the Senior Warden, and the part we took in the services of the following day, the day of the Annual Commemoration, have left an impression never to be effaced. The rescue of this ancient home of the clergy from ages of neglect and decay; and from its more recent desecration to unworthy and unhallowed purposes; its reconstruction chiefly through the munificence of A. J. Beresford Hope, Esq.; and its restoration to the purposes of the training of Missionary Clergy, carrying with them an open Bible, rather than an uplifted wooden cross; and its connection with the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, are all matters already well known to our readers. During that visit, we listened with delight to the speeches of returned Missionaries of that venerable Society, and our satisfaction knew no bounds when we learned, that on the shores of heathen lands the Missionaries of this Society are conscious of the presence of no line of separation between themselves and the Missionaries of the Church Missionary Society. On another occasion, we heard the new Bishop of London, on the platform of the one Society, only a few days after he had made one of the most popular speeches before the other. And again, at Manchester, we heard the eloquent Bishop of Oxford declare that he had belonged to the Church Missionary Society from his youth up, but felt that he could not fairly have been entitled to this privilege, had he not given preference, in some sort, to the older Institution.

During the few hours we were in that grand, old, baronial city of the Clergy, Durham, we went over that sombre, vast and rambling old structure, the Castle or late Bishop's Palace,

surrendered by the late Bishop Van Mildert to the uses of a College, chiefly for the supply of Clergy for the North. And amongst our last hours in England, some of the most pleasing were passed in surveying St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, whose objects are similar to those of the College at Cuddesdon, and whose influence for good is rapidly extending.

There are, we know, other Institutions of the kind, in other parts of the kingdom, but our method requires that we should testify only "those things which we have seen." If permitted to introduce mere hearsay evidence, there is one of these Schools, that which is connected with the Diocese of Bath and Wells, and flourishing under the shelter of its beautiful Cathedral, of whose method of instruction, and care for the highest religious culture of the young men connected with it, we heard such good things from an eye witness, but, to be sure, over-partial friend, as inspires the hope, that the Clergy trained there will leave a very deep mark upon the generations to come.

We have no means, at hand, of verifying our impression with regard to the ratio of increase of the Clergy of the Establishment since the time of Elizabeth, when compared with the increase of the number of Churches; but it is believed that it is so much greater as that from 10,000 or 11,000 then; they now amount to nearly 20,000. In education and refinement of manners, and in a just appreciation of the nature of the Sacred Office, and above all, in laborious and conscientious devotion to its duties, there has been a still greater improvement. So much so, that we are fully persuaded that no Established Church in any country in Europe, since the days of Constantine, has been as faithfully served and as thoroughly well worked. Isolated and solitary specimens of remiss, negligent and pleasure-seeking Clergy, may, indeed, here and there be found, but as a class they have disappeared, and no young clergyman can hope for advancement upon any other condition than establishing a well-earned character of being a working man. Rank and connections are by no means without their advantages, but nothing can compensate for the absence of earnestness and zeal.

**PREACHING TO THE POOR.**—The first insight we had into the details of English Church Work, was at Islington, when the Dean of Carlisle preached on the evening of a week day to fifteen hundred persons, mostly of the working classes, many in their working dresses, upon the call of the Vicar, who had arranged these services for their benefit, every



night for a week, distinguished Preachers having been invited for the purpose, from all parts of the kingdom, the established parishioners retiring to the galleries. At Cheltenham and amongst the most highly educated class, the zealous Dean has long maintained the reputation of one of the most eloquent and effective preachers of any age of the Church. Never before did we listen to so perfect an adjustment of those two almost irreconcilable elements of popular preaching, the elevated, the classical and the dignified, to the entire satisfaction of the most fastidious; and the familiar, the illustrative, even down to the narrative, so as to meet most delightfully the cravings of the most illiterate. And yet this was by no means the chief or highest merit of the sermon we heard; that consisted in the true ringing sound of the Gospel, like a trumpet call resounding through all its parts, appealing to the heart and the conscience, and awakening such a measure of emotion as led the excellent Vicar to ask us, whether we did not suppose, if such preaching, to such crowds, should be kept up for weeks, with the object in view of producing similar results, the same scenes of wild excitement might not be witnessed there, as he had seen described in the camp-meetings of America? We have no doubt of it; and as little that it was more wise and more Christian to pause far short of it.

At Canterbury, passing, in company with its distinguished and newly made Dean, through its Chapter House, only a few hours after he had been one of the preachers at Exeter Hall, we obtained his calm judgment, as to the probable good results of that remarkable movement. It was in the highest degree hopeful. And yet there is a diversity of opinion on this point, even among the best of men. The fly-leaf Litanies, together with the words of the Psalm and Hymn to be sung, and the name of the tune to each, had been distributed over the room by thousands, and the way in which the responses were made, and the singing was rendered, was like the voice of many waters.

The Chapter House at Canterbury, unlike the far more beautiful structures at York and Salisbury, is a rectangular edifice of large dimensions, and singularly enough, has come down to us from ancient times bearing the honest Protestant name of Preaching House. The good Dean was rejoicing in the hope of seeing it fitted up with seats, for preaching to the poor. Coincident with all this, how striking is the call of a Committee of Convocation, that the Deans and Chapters of all the Cathedrals should provide seats for the immense and now comparatively useless naves of all of them, and to invite the

most eloquent and effective preachers of the Church, without regard to party names, to preach in them the Gospel to the poor; with a short Service similar to that which we have above described !

**MISSIONS.**—All the indications above specified of a vigorous and healthy Church-life, relate to the condition of the body itself, and shows that all its legitimate functions, for its own purposes, are duly performed. No small part of its proper action, however, is external to itself. Indeed, Church-life can only be truly vigorous when it is aggressive. At any rate, this must ever be the case whilst new conquests for the Cross remain to be achieved. The nature of our associations whilst in England, brought us more into connection with this great work than with any other. The life, the stir, the animation all around seemed to us to be mainly of this character. What can we do for India, for Africa, for the Colonies? Is it possible by increased voluntary effort, to make up to the Society for Propagating the Gospel, the sad deficiency of \$55,000 a year, occasioned by the withdrawal of the Queen's Letters; and at the same time meet the increased demands of new stations?

We were struck with admiration at the perfection of the vast yet simple machinery, by which so many hundreds of thousands of dollars are every year collected, mostly in small sums, to sustain this noble Society, and the Church Missionary Society, besides the vast amount derived from members of the Established Church for the support of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London Missionary Society, the Missions of the United Brethren, and which are diverted into other channels. Hardly a day in the Calendar which is not the Anniversary of some Auxiliary; nor a Parish without its collectors; nor an eloquent speaker, or returned Missionary not engaged upon some delegation, to rekindle, somewhere, the flame of Christian zeal. The hearts of all the praying and pious portion of the Church of England, are yearning for the conversion of the world; and in this respect no difference was perceived in one portion above another. No doubt we saw the best, and for that Grace which has produced it, we shall never cease to give thanks to our Heavenly Father. We rejoice, also, that we have lived to witness so large an increase of the same spirit in our branch of the Church, and to know that the old party lines of distinction in this regard, are being more and more effaced. The theory on which our Church is acting in this matter is very beautiful;—the Missionary field,

the world;—the great Missionary Society, the General Convention;—and every baptized person, a contributing member; but, in practice, the English Church, for whatever reason, is obliged to rely on voluntary associations, district collectors, parish auxiliaries, spirited public meetings, and a perpetual stream of authentic missionary intelligence!

**COLONIAL EPISCOPATES.**—The out-working of the vigorous Church-life in England, in nothing is more manifest than in the vast increase of Bishops for distant portions of the Colonial Empire. How impressive to realize that the Bishops of the English Succession amount to just about an hundred; and that the poetic fiction of the drum-beat never ceasing, is almost literally realized upon the Lord's Day with regard to the voice of Prayer and Praise, in the simple but sublime strains of our Liturgy.

The Bishop of Victoria, and the Bishop of Rupert's Land, from the far Orient and the distant West, were both at home, reviving and extending the warm interest felt in their respective Missions, and making a rally for the additional laborers whom they have secured. And the Dean of Capetown, and a returned Missionary from Kafferland, were repeatedly upon the same platform with us, describing in the most life-like and striking manner, the toils and sacrifices of their Missionary Bishops, and their noble band of fellow-workers. Considering the foregoings of these men, and how many of them had been brought up upon the lap of ease, the proverbial heroism of the Nestorians, of the Jesuits, and of the Moravians, certainly never shone with more apostolic lustre.

At a dinner, given by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, just before the recess of Parliament for the Whitsuntide-holidays, to such of the Bishops as were in town, in sad and subdued whispers, the news just received, went round, of the death, so soon after entering upon his duties, of that eminent man of God, Dr. Weeks, the Bishop of Sierra Leone. Anxious misgivings were expressed whether it were right to send forth white men to a post of danger, where almost instant death seemed inevitable; and as anxious inquiries were made whether the time had come, and the right man could be found, to commission as a son of Africa, to renew the line of her ancient Cyprianic Bishops. A distinguished Statesman and a friend of the African race, on another occasion, remarked upon all this, that it reminded him of a saying attributed to the Rev. Sydney Smith, that England always had two Bish-

ops of Sierra Leone, a live one going out, and a dead one coming home.

To all this, the energetic and decided Secretary of the Church Missionary Society at once replied, that whatever might be said of the principle of furnishing every land, as soon as possible, with an indigenous Clergy, the time had no more come for doing it in Western Africa, than in other parts of the foreign field; that while there were white Presbyters and Catechists upon that shore, there must also be a white Bishop at their head; and that it were shame, whilst the Army and Navy and Commercial Houses were officered by white men, heroically carrying their lives in their hand, if a long line of Bishops could not yet be found, "not counting their lives dear unto themselves;" and that with regard to the pithy saying attributed to the Rev. Sydney Smith, it must be altogether apocryphal, since, not only had no such contingency occurred before, but that he believed that the first Bishop of Sierra Leone was not consecrated till after Sydney Smith's death.

Listening to all this, at the moment our own feelings were oppressed by grief at the early and sudden death of several of our own noble, young soldiers of the Cross on the fatal shores of Africa, before they had had opportunity to strike one blow for their Lord, some idea may be formed of the emotion with which we have just read an account of the consecration of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Brown, in the Chapel at Lambeth, to succeed the late lamented Bishop. A gentleman, a scholar, a man of wealth, and of no mean mark as an Eastern traveler, he has said, with all those facts staring him in the face, "Here am I, send me!" Whilst such men abound in the Church of England, she cannot be so very near her fall. May as long and as useful an Episcopate be granted to him as to our own devoted Bishop Payne!

**PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.**—In the absence of any such national system as our Common Schools, the importance and value of the efforts of the Church for the education of the poor, will be at once perceived. It would be quite wrong, however, to infer that the Government is doing nothing. On the other hand, the offer of aid to a very considerable extent, upon certain conditions, is acting as a very effective and healthy stimulant to increase the amount of local contributions. We see it stated that, at present, the Church gets nine thirteenthths of the Parliamentary grant. The cause of popular education is also greatly on the increase. Prince Albert

stated, in his speech at the London Conference, that while in half a century population has only doubled itself within these islands, the number of schools has increased as 14 to 1: that in 1801, the number of schools in England and Wales was between 3,000 and 4,000, while in 1851, it had risen to 46,000; and that while the proportion of day scholars to the entire population was, in 1818, 1 to 17, it was, in 1833, 1 to 11, and in 1851, 1 to 8. And the advantage gained, as to a perfectly homogeneous and very decided religious influence in many a school, is prodigious. The Government, unfortunately, has not yet assumed the position, that the whole property of the country may well be held responsible for a plain common English education, for the entire population of the country. But the Church has assumed the responsibility of giving such an education to all her baptized children; and something more, a religious training, thoroughly imbued with the sound principles of the Bible and of the Prayer Book. Add to this the influence of Sunday Schools, by no means less general or effective than our own, and the cause is made palpable of that larger amount of Bible knowledge, and that deeper and firmer implantation of religious principle which is apparent in the better classes of the English poor, when compared with the rural population of most if not all of the American States. To say that our own children, taking the year through, do not receive a tenth part of the religious training of the English youth, while it would surprise many of our readers, would yet probably be no exaggeration.

The anxiety and godly jealousy of the more Christian portion of the English public, with regard to the healthy working of our American Institutions, upon which they feel, as well as we, that so much of the hope of the world depends, was directed with greater intensity to no point, than to this—"Are not your Common Schools, Godless and Christless? or, if not so now, are they not drifting towards that abyss?" And when, in the presence of assembled thousands, it would be said, "long time ago, when Cæsar would say, I will give you money to support a particular form of Church government, if you will let me regulate matters in my own way; and we had firmly replied, we will have none of it; we prefer to manage our own religious matters in our own way!"—so now again the time, perhaps, is approaching when we shall say the same with regard to our Common Schools:—in any event, it is fully believed that if the time should ever come (of which we have no fear) that the New Testament should be denied as a School Book, and prayer excluded from the School House, that the

entire religious population would rise as one man, and repudiate the Common School System, and establish Parochial Schools of their own ;"—when, in such a presence, sentiments like these were expressed, it made the nerves thrill and the heart beat, to listen to the thunders of applause with which they would be received.

**TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR TEACHERS.**—Where there is no State System of Common Schools, there will, of course, be no State Normal Schools. In England, the term itself is not in common use. The necessity for the thing exists of course ; and if we may judge by the specimen of a Training School for Female Teachers which we inspected ; and by others, both Male and Female, with regard to which we made diligent inquiries, we should say that they were in no way inferior to our best State Normal Schools. They may be less expert in teaching the art and the practice of teaching, which, if it be so, is much to be regretted, but they are far more snug and home-like ; there are more of them, upon a more limited scale, and blessed with a more careful and minute supervision, and in the estimation of one who places Church training close along side of religious training, the comparison is largely in favor of the English system. In how many Dioceses they are to be found, or to what extent they are aided by grants from Government, we are not informed. The one we visited was at Salisbury, and of the two in or near Brighton, of which we heard the most, the only complaint made was the amount of effort it required to sustain them on the voluntary principle. They were sustained, however, and well sustained, and no doubt was expressed with regard to the future.

**CARE FOR THE POOR.**—Nothing struck us more favorably than to observe, in rural and manufacturing districts, how completely reversed, in some respects, the pastoral relation seemed to be. Here, with us, the people either really do take care of the poor minister, or at least, are supposed to do so. There the minister, whether rich or poor, is expected to take care of the still poorer people. And well and faithfully is it now almost everywhere done. Ages of neglect had alienated myriads of the poor from the Church ; but so natural and strong is the tie which binds them, above all others, to the Church provided for them, that only a few years of faithful care is already winning myriads back. It was emphatically in this direction that the remark was boldly made, that no Established Church since the time of Constantine had been as well worked as that of England now is. There are, evidently, two sides

to the question of Poor Rates; that they have been a refuge for the deserving poor, there can be no doubt;—that they often act as a bonus upon idleness and utter inefficiency, can as little be questioned. That there is ample occasion for the vast amount of endowed and private charities; for more liberal Church offerings; and for more than all that the Clergy can do for them, is quite as certain. Over population, and overgrown landed estates must work out just such results. Thank God, in new countries, the payment of these sad penalties is indefinitely postponed.

But even here, in our crowded cities and large manufacturing places, until such time as true Christians arouse to do the full work of the Church, and in the way ordained of Christ in His Church, the work, to some extent, will be done by mutual aid Societies, in some Masonic or Odd-Fellow form; and, of course, the Church will suffer, and deserves to suffer, for her neglect. In England, this work is done, and well done, for the present, by their Clubs. And at Wilton, we were delighted to be the witness of noble efforts, presided over by landed proprietors and a distinguished Statesman, and favored with the countenance and benediction of the Church, to redeem several such Clubs from mismanagement, and to concentrate their influence and usefulness into a county organization. Its reserved funds already amount to \$100,000, and its influence in repressing the vices, increasing the forecast and elevating the character of the worthy and industrious poor is very manifest.

It is no part of our office to stand forth as the eulogist of the Church of England. Laudatory remarks, in set forms of speech, are quite as little to our task as they would be to the liking of the earnest and good men, who not only admitted us to their excellent society whilst going about their customary work, but were kind enough, as far as the proprieties of time and place would permit, to give us an humble share in it. The impression, we grant, of what we have here written, is, in the highest degree, complimentary. It would have been in very bad taste, indeed, in such a connection, to have "set down aught in malice;" or to have detected faults; or to have animadverted upon deficiencies. We have been speaking of English Church Work lately done, or now doing; not of the neglected, or desirable, much less of the impossible. And by any measure which wise and good men have been accustomed to apply, to test the value of principles, or the working of institutions, or the results of experiment, we are free to confess, that we esteem "the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England very highly in love, for their work's sake!" We



bless God for that "grace of His, which we saw to be in them, and more largely heard to be in them!"

What are some of the best of these tests? Are they not such as these; the degree of reverence for, and yet intimate and familiar knowledge of the Word of God; the simplicity and fulness with which the doctrines of that Word are preached, precisely in their Scriptural connections; whilst yet the Sacraments are duly honored, reverently administered, and numerous frequented; the way in which the Lord's Day is observed, where no special causes exist for its greater desecration; the sturdy manner with which all such efforts at desecration are met and resisted; the steady, serious, earnest and profitable manner in which vast numbers of all classes of persons attend to the duty of Family Prayer; and the largeness of the amounts annually contributed out of vast incomes and small earnings, for the promotion of every good word and work? Whichever of these tests may be applied, the result is equally, and what is well worthy of remark, proportionably manifest. All tests are here purposely omitted, which seem to turn upon what are called doctrinal views, or party measures. These which we have given are tangible results, known and read of all men; and, in our estimation, they place the Church of England in so high a position, not only in contrast with the Church of Rome, in all Roman Catholic Countries; but also in comparison with every other Protestant Country in Europe, as to compel every candid and impartial mind which has observed these facts, to inquire, what is the cause of this difference? Is it the effect of an open Bible more largely read and studied, and more widely scattered abroad? Or is it the working of the element of race and blood? Or of liberal and free institutions? Or of the influence of a world-wide commerce, and the consequent enlargement of ideas and expansion of mind? Or are these results to be traced to all these causes combined, under the guidance and influence of a Branch of the Church of Christ duly organized and administered according to His holy ordinance?

With these inquiries we take leave of our readers, with the expression of sincere regret that we have failed, even beyond our fears, in the art of skillful condensation; we only ask that our readers will not fail to group together the facts to which we have adverted; since, as we conceive, they will fall far short of a just estimate of the kind and amount of English Church Work now going on, unless they can combine, into one view, all which we have above written, together with the impressions of as many more witnesses, as there are descriptions of work and scenes of labor.

## ART. V.—POPE CLEMENT XI AND THE JANSENISTS.\*

OF the internal contests in the Romish Church during the Eighteenth Century, the most important was that with the Jansenists. Ever since the days of Augustine and Pelagius, the Roman Catholic world, and especially the French Church, has been agitated at times by violent disputes respecting the ability of fallen man to perform holy acts, or respecting the Decrees of God, Free Agency, and the nature and operations of Divine Grace.† In the year 1653, Pope Innocent X condemned Five Propositions extracted from the works of Jansenius: and to save the character of this author without rejecting the bull, the Jansenists maintained, that those propositions were justly condemned, but that they were not to be found in the book of Jansenius, or at least not in the sense condemned.

These propositions were as follows:

1. There are some commands of God, which righteous and good men find it impossible to obey, with their present powers; nor have they the Grace necessary to render obedience practicable.

2. Internal Grace is never resisted by fallen man.

3. To be praise or blame-worthy in this fallen state, man does not need to be free from necessity, but only from coercion.

4. The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of internal preventing Grace for performing single acts, and even for beginning to have faith; but they were heretical in maintaining that the human will can either resist or obey this Grace.

5. To say that Christ died and shed his blood, for all men without exception, is Semi-Pelagian.‡

To cut off this retreat, Alexander VII, in 1656, declared the

---

\* From the unpublished MSS. of the late Rev. JAMES MURDOCK, D. D. Dr. Murdock left valuable historical papers, the fruit of his most mature learning, some of which will hereafter appear in the *CHURCH REVIEW*.

† For an account of such disputes in the *fifth* century, see Mosheim's *Institutes*, Vol. I, p. 370. For the disputes in the *ninth* century, see Vol. II, p. 90, &c. For the disputes in the *sixteenth* century, in the times of Baius and Molina, when the Dominicans and Jesuits took opposite sides, see Vol. III, p. 109, &c. For those in the *seventeenth* century, when Jansenius became so conspicuous, see Vol. III, pp. 327 and 344. Some account of the disputes in this *eighteenth* century, is given in Vol. III, p. 486, &c.

‡ See Bullar. Mag. Tom. V, p. 486.

Five Propositions to be actually in Jansenius' book, and in the very sense in which they were condemned. He likewise prescribed an oath to this effect, which all ecclesiastics were to subscribe. Some refused the oath, alleging that papal infallibility does not extend to questions of *fact* such as were here contested, but only to points of doctrine and of ecclesiastical law. Others declined subscribing, but promised to show respect for the papal decision, by remaining silent on the subject. Others again were willing to subscribe, if they might do it with some qualification: and this, Clement IX, in the year 1669, permitted. But soon after, Louis XIV, urged by the Jesuits, insisted on an unqualified subscription: and until the end of the century, he harrassed and persecuted the Jansenists.\*

Innocent XII, near the close of the preceding century, disapproved of qualified subscriptions, and declared that the five condemned propositions were to be understood in their simple and *obvious sense*, as they stood in the bulls. This the cunning Quesnel construed in a way to favor the Jansenists. He said, the Pontiff required only a condemnation of the naked propositions as they stood in the bull of Innocent X, and several persons subscribed on this principle.† In view of these circumstances, some crafty persons in the year 1701, submitted to the Doctors of the Sorbonne this fictitious case of conscience, drawn up with the greatest precision and care. A confessor having learned from common fame and from the man's own acknowledgment, that his penitent was a real Jansenist; that he read the principal Jansenist books, believed with them on most points of doctrine, and regarded Jansenius as unjustly condemned; yet that he had subscribed the oath without qualification, and professed to be bound only to a respectful silence in the controversy; the confessor was in doubt whether such a person should receive absolution. Forty Doctors of the Sorbonne answered, that this penitent's opinions were neither new nor singular, nor condemned by the Church, and therefore, not such as he should be required to renounce in order to absolution. The next year a pamphlet was circulated, stating the case and the decision upon it. The Archbishop of Rheims, Natalis Alexander, and others, approved of the decision; but the majority of the French Bishops disapproved of it; and in the year 1703, the Pope formally condemned it, and suppressed

---

\* Mosheim, Vol. III, p. 332, &c.

† Fleury, continuat., Vol. LXVI, pp. 185, 188.

the pamphlet, as one containing abominable doctrines.\* He also wrote to the King and to the Archbishop of Paris, to punish the authors and abettors of such pernicious principles. The King commanded the Sorbonnists and others who had approved the decision, to retract, on pain of exile. Du Pin and three more refused, and were banished. Most of the others agreed to abide by the judgment of Archbishop Noailles; and he declared the discussion of such a subject, at such a time, and after the repeated and explicit decisions of the Pontiffs, to be improper. The next year the Doctors of the Sorbonne condemned the pamphlet, and declared that the decision was not made in a regular meeting of their body, but only in a private meeting of the forty Doctors. The theologians of Douay and Louvain also condemned the decision. Du Pin and two of the other exiles now retracted, and were restored; but Petit Pied still refused, was treated as a heretic, and imprisoned, till finding means to escape prison, he fled the country. During this conflict the Jansenists made great efforts to obtain the liberty of private opinion; but it was to no purpose; the power of an absolute monarch guided by Jesuitical influence, and urged on by the authority of an energetic Pontiff, bore down all before it.†

In the Low Countries, but especially in Holland, the Jansenists, or Augustinians, as they called themselves, were numerous and resolute. There Jansenius himself had lived, as a professor at Louvain, and then as Bishop of Ypres: there the persecuted Jansenists of France often found refuge; there Anthony Arnauld and Pasquier Quesnel, who were at the head of the sect, held their residence. Nearly all the Roman Catholics in Holland were Jansenists; and having no Bishop, they were governed by a nuncio, who was always elected by the chapter of Utrecht, and then ordained a Bishop *in partibus* by the Pontiff. Peter Codde, the nuncio from A. D. 1688, was a decided Jansenist. In 1697, he was accused at Rome of heresy, and after two years suspended and cited to Rome for trial. In his place one Theodore Cock was sent to govern the Dutch Roman Catholics. But they would not submit to him, and applied to the States General. They, in 1702, forbid Cock to exercise his functions; decreed that no person should be recognized or officiate as nuncio in Holland, unless first approved by the government; and demanded that Codde should be restored to that office.‡ The Pontiff, Clement XI,

\* Bullar. Magn. Tom. XII, p. 385.

† *Fleurij*, continuat., Vol. LXVI, 609—681. *Du Pin*, Comp. Hist. of the Church, Vol. IV, p. 231, &c.

‡ *Kerkelyk Placaatboek*, door P. Scheltus, 2de Deel. p. 423.

found it necessary to allow Codde to return home, on his making some concessions, and promising to advise the Roman Catholics to be quiet, and not to resume himself the powers of a nuncio. At the same time, the Pontiff wrote to the Emperor, and to the electors of the Palatinate, Treves and Mayence, to endeavor to persuade the Dutch government to allow the papal arm to crush Jansenism in that country. But all was to no purpose. Cock and the priests who adhered to him were sent out of the country; and Bishop Codde, though silenced at Rome in 1705, was chosen by the chapter of Utrecht to rule the diocese, and remained at the head of the Dutch Roman Catholics until his death in 1710.\*

In June, 1705, at the request of the kings of France and Spain, the Pontiff issued a bull, entitled *Vineam Domini*, which was to settle authoritatively all Jansenistical disputes. After writing and commenting on the bulls of preceding Popes, the Pontiff declares that subscribers to the oath of Alexander VII, must believe from the heart that the Five Propositions are found, and bearing the same sense, in the writings of Jansenius; and moreover, that a promise to observe a respectful silence on the subject, is not sufficient. Louis XIV laid this bull before the French Bishops, assembled at Paris in August; and they decreed unanimously, I. That Bishops are, by divine appointment, competent to judge on points of doctrine. II. That papal bulls, when accepted by the whole body of Bishops, become obligatory on the whole Church. III. That such acceptation is to be a *judicial* act. They then proceed to accept this bull, with all veneration and submission; and to request the King to have it registered by the parliament of Paris, and published by his authority, that it may become a law of the land. Accordingly it was so registered and published; but no clergyman was required to subscribe to it. The bull was likewise approved by the Doctors of the Sorbonne, by the parliament of Paris, and by the University of Louvain. Yet one licentiate of Louvain declared that it was a "work of darkness, worthy of Antichrist;" and one French Bishop refused to accept it.† No new subscription was required by this bull, but as the nuns of Port Royal des Champs had given great offense by their former obstinacy, it was deemed proper to demand from them a written acceptance of the bull. When compelled to sign the form drawn up for them, they subjoined,

\* *Fleury*, continuat., Vol. LXVII, p. 1, &c. 104 *Schroeckh*, Vol. VII, p. 448. *Schlegel*, Vol. V, p. 1015, &c.

† *Fleury*, continuat., Vol. LXVII, p. 258-279. *Du Pin* Compend. Hist. of the Church, Vol. IV, p. 234.

that this was not to derogate from the peace of Clement IX, which allowed of a qualified subscription. The Archbishop objected to this addition, and required a simple acceptance; but they said they could conscientiously condemn the Five Propositions, but to say that these propositions were found in Jansenius' book and in the same sense, was beyond their knowledge, because they could not read Latin. Upon this, the Archbishop deprived them of the Sacraments; and the King obtained from the Pope a bull suppressing this monastery. Their advocate was sent to the *bastille*. All the nuns were seized, and distributed among convents less disobedient. The lieutenant of police, in 1709, caused this house to be totally demolished; and two years after, the bodies interred in this Church and cemetery were dug up and removed.\*

In January, 1706, the Pope wrote to the French Bishops, reprimanding them for claiming the right to examine and judge of the correctness of his decisions. He tells them that his great joy on receiving their vote accepting the bull, was exceedingly disturbed by the letters and publications which informed him of their attack upon the sovereign power of the Apostolic See. He is willing to believe that these measures were the work of a few corrupt men, who, being conscious of heresy, feared lest due punishment should overtake them. Nevertheless, he adds, "It is a thing altogether intolerable, that a few Bishops—and they presiding over Churches that owe all their privileges and honors to the kindness and favor of the Roman Pontiff—should rise up against the author of their distinction and fame, and should assail the rights of the highest See, which are based not on human but divine authority. Ask your progenitors, and they will tell you that it is not for local Bishops to discuss the decrees of the Apostolic See, but to obey them." Then, quoting from Leo the Great, he proceeds: "Very far, therefore, were the excellent Bishops of Gaul in ancient times from arrogating the right to discuss the ordinances of the Apostolic See, which they received as implicitly as they did the Creed. Nor did they think it fit to spend their time and care in deliberating whether to execute those ordinances; they deemed it enough for them to charge their memories with them, so as to be able to confute heretics; and they taught (what you ought especially to notice) that the decisions of the Roman Pontiff are not be judged of by *their* belief, but rather, their belief is to be viewed as solid and cor-

---

\* *Du Pin*, Compend. Hist. of the Church, Vol. IV, p. 235. *Voltaire*, *Siecle de Louis XIV*, Tom. II, p. 205.

rect, because it accords with the decision of the Roman Pontiff." After another quotation, he says: "Neither does your superior knowledge of sacred literature nor your diligence in searching out the ancient monuments of the Church allow you to be ignorant of that which every Church throughout the world knows; namely, that the See of the blessed Apostle Peter has the right of judging over every Church, and that its judgments can be reviewed by none."—"Hence you may learn that, in this case, we do not ask your advice, or call for your votes, or wait to know your opinion; but we enjoin upon you obedience, even that obedience which, at your holy consecration, you solemnly promised to render to the blessed Apostle Peter, to the holy Romish Church, and to us and to our Apostolic decrees and commands."—"Let the order of Bishops, then, retain its proper rank and dignity; but let it not overstep the boundaries our fathers established. The Romish Church is the mother of all Churches; and let no inferior prelates presume to instruct the mistress, or to judge her, or to rejudge her judgments."—"Let us hold fast the unity of the Catholic Church; the unity transmitted to us from our ancestors, which consists chiefly in this, that, although there are among the people of God many priests and many pastors, yet Peter properly governs them all, under Christ the chief Ruler."\* The Pontiff complained also to the King of France; and the King ordered Noailles and the other Bishops to give satisfaction to his Holiness. Accordingly, Noailles, with eleven other prelates, drew up an explanation of the views of the synod, which modified considerably the aspect of their votes. This explanation, together with a letter to the Pontiff which Noailles was to attach to it, was submitted to the inspection of the papal nuncio, who consulted his Holiness, and then approved them. But Noailles delayed signing these papers a long time; and at length, when urged on the subject, he made some alterations in the letter affecting the rhetoric more than the sense, and transmitted both to the Pope. The Pontiff now complained of the alterations in the letter. Noailles said there were no alterations. The Pope then transmitted both forms of the letter to the King, who discovered the facts, and required Noailles to transcribe the original letter word for word, and send it to Rome.†

PASQUIER QUESNEL, from this time onward, became the prominent name in this controversy. He was a priest of the

\* *Fleury*, continuat., Vol. LXVII, p. 390, &c.

† *Ib.*, p. 364, &c.



Oratory at Paris, and had published the works of Leo the Great, in 1675, with learned notes, in which he defended the liberties of the Gallic Church in a manner so offensive to the Romish court as to cause his book to be condemned by the Inquisition. In the year 1678, the majority of his Order were overawed, in their convention, to declare publicly their rejection of Augustinian doctrines, which Quesnel labored hard to prevent. His residence at Paris now became unpleasant to him, and he removed to Brussels, where he was intimate with Anthony Arnould, and at the death of that great man, in 1694, became the head and leader of the Jansenists. While in the Oratory at Paris, this gifted man applied himself closely to the study of the New Testament, as the rule of his Order required. He also wrote some pious reflections and explanatory notes on the Gospels; which he first published in Latin, and then in French with enlargements, in the year 1671. The work was admired for its lucid brevity, but especially for the pious unction which pervaded it. Quesnel was encouraged to extend his reflections and notes, in the same strain, over the whole New Testament; and, adopting the version of Mons with some corrections, he so enlarged the work in subsequent editions that at last it filled eight volumes 12mo. It was now in very high reputation among the lovers of piety, had a wide circulation, and was commended by the most distinguished prelates, such as Archbishop Noailles, to whom one edition was dedicated, and Bossuet, the renowned Bishop of Meaux. Indeed, Voltaire tells us, that the Abbé Renaudet being at Rome in the year 1701, found the Pope one day reading Quesnel's New Testament, who said to the Abbé, "This is an excellent book; we have no one at Rome that can write like this; I wish I could have the author near me."\* But the book inculcated Augustinian sentiments, and was therefore odious to the Jesuits and to all the opposers of Jansenism. In the year 1703, the Bishop of Gap forbid its circulation in his diocese; and in the same year, Quesnel was seized and imprisoned by the Archbishop of Mechlin, and, escaping, fled into Holland, where he remained in safety at Amsterdam, till his death at an advanced age in 1719. In the year 1708, this book was condemned and proscribed by a papal bull; partly on the ground that it followed the text of the prohibited version of Mons, but more on the ground that it contained the seditious, perverse and heretical doctrines of Jansenius.

---

\* *Siecle de Louis XIV*, Tome II, p. 206.

This bull, however, was not received in France, in consequence of the political animosities at that time existing between the Pontiff and the House of Bourbon. On the death of LeChaise, the King's confessor, in 1709, his place was filled by another Jesuit, Le Tellier, a man of a more dark and ferocious character; and he so governed the old King's mind, and so wrought upon the French Bishops, as to bring Jansenism, and all who favored it, into imminent danger. First he excited the Bishops of Rochelle and Lucon to issue injunctions in 1710, condemning and prohibiting the New Testament of Quesnel in their dioceses, and casting censures on those who had recommended or circulated the book. Noailles, to whom the book was dedicated, and who had publicly recommended it, felt himself personally attacked; and as these injunctions were hawked about Paris and exposed in all the shops, he issued a pastoral letter prohibiting their sale at Paris. The two Bishops complained to the King; and with his permission, they carried the cause to Rome, where *their* injunctions received Papal approbation, while that of Noailles was disapproved. The contest, however, did not stop here; the French Bishops took different sides, and the nation was divided into two great conflicting parties. The King, guided by his confessor, requested the Pontiff to interpose authoritatively, and to enumerate and condemn, in a formal bull, the errors contained in Quesnel's book. The Pope consented, and appointed a special Congregation of Cardinals and Theologians, one of whom was a Jesuit, to examine the book. At the same time, Tellier and his friends forwarded to Rome a list of one hundred and three Propositions, which they wished to have condemned. The Congregation sat twice a week for nearly two years, with the Pope generally at their head, and after fully discussing every point, agreed upon a result; and the Pontiff, not without objections from some of his Cardinals, issued the important BULL UNIGENITUS, (so called from the first word of it,) on the 11th of September, 1713.

This bull so clearly stated the chief points in controversy between the Jansenists or Augustinians, and their opposers, and has had so important a bearing on the theology, as well as the peace of the Romish Church, that it is deemed proper to give here the leading ideas in it, with a translation of the one hundred and one Propositions it condemns.

The preamble states, that the Only Begotten Son of God (*Unigenitus Dei Filius*) has admonished us to beware of false prophets, who come to us in sheep's clothing; that is, deceivers, who under the show of piety, insinuate pernicious doc-

trines. § 1. Being thus admonished, we were grieved to see Quesnel's New Testament widely circulating, approved by many, and poisoning the flock of Christ. § 2. We therefore issue this bull, in order to give more distinct warning than we gave in our former bull condemning the same work. § 3. Louis XIV and many Bishops requested such a bull; and we hope it will be salutary. § 4. Great pains have been taken not to mistake the author's meaning: and the following are the Propositions which we distinctly condemn:

1. To the soul which has parted from God and His Grace, what else remains but sin, and the consequences of sin, proud poverty, and sluggish indigence, that is, a general impotence for God's service, for prayer, and for every good work?

2. The Grace of Christ, that efficacious principle of every species of good, is necessary to every good work: without it, not only nothing *is* done, but nothing *can* be done.

3. In vain, Lord, thou layest commands upon us, unless thou *givest* what thou commandest.

4. Yea, Lord, all things are possible, to whom thou *makest* them so, by working them in him.

5. Unless God softens the heart by the internal unction of His Grace, exhortation and external favors only serve to render it more hard.

6. The difference between the Jewish Covenant and the Christian, is, that in the former God requires the sinner to forsake sin and obey His Law, yet leaves him in his impotence; but in the latter, God *confers* on the sinner what He requires of him, by purifying him with His Grace.

7. What advantage for man under the Old Covenant, in which God left him to his own weakness, yet imposed on him His Law? And what a blessedness it is, to be admitted to the New Covenant, in which God *gives* us that which He requires of us!

8. We do not pertain to the New Covenant, except so far as we are partakers of its new Grace, which works in us what God enjoins upon us.

9. The Grace of Christ is Sovereign Grace; without it we can never confess Christ, and with it we never deny Him.

10. Grace is the operation of God's omnipotent hand, which nothing can hinder or retard.

11. Grace is nothing but the will of the omnipotent God commanding, and effecting what he commands.

12. When God determines to save a soul, at whatever time, and in whatever place, the effect indubitably follows the volition of God.

13. When God determines that a soul shall be saved, and touches it with the hand of His internal Grace, no human volition resists Him.

14. However far a sinner may be from salvation, when Jesus exhibits Himself to his view in the saving light of His Grace, the sinner cannot but submit, run to Christ, humble himself, and adore his Saviour.

15. When God accompanies His command and His eternal call with

the unction of His Spirit, and the internal powers of His Grace, this operates in the heart *that* obedience which He requires.

16. There are no allurements which do not give way to the allurements of Grace; because nothing can resist the Omnipotent.

17. Grace is that voice of the Father, which reaches the hearts of men and makes them come to Jesus Christ: whoever does not come to Him after hearing the external call of the Son, has never been taught of the Father.

18. The seed of the Word, which the hand of God waters, always produces its fruit.

19. The Grace of God is nothing but His omnipotent good pleasure. This is the idea which God Himself teaches us in all the Scriptures.

20. It is a true idea of Grace, that God wills our obedience to Him, and it is rendered; He commands, and everything is performed; He speaks as Lord, and all is submission to Him.

21. The Grace of Jesus Christ is powerful, mighty, supreme, invincible; because it is the operation of the will of the Omnipotent, a consequence and resemblance of that operation of God's power, by which the Son of God became incarnate, and arose from the dead.

22. The agreement of God's almighty operation on the human heart with the free consent of man's will, is at once exhibited to us in the Incarnation, as the fountain and archetype of all the other operations of mercy and Grace, which are all as gratuitous and as dependent on God as was that original operation.

23. God Himself has given us an idea of His almighty Grace, by comparing it to that by which He produces creatures out of nothing, and raises the dead to life.

24. The correct idea which the centurion had of the omnipotence of God and Christ in curing human bodies by merely willing it, is like the idea which we should have of the omnipotence of His Grace in curing souls of their cupidity.

25. God illuminates the soul and heals it, just as He does the body, merely by a volition: He commands, and obedience follows.

26. No Graces are bestowed, but through faith.

27. Faith is the primary Grace, and the fountain of all the rest.

28. The first Grace that God gives the sinner, is remission of sins.

29. Out of the Church, no Graces are conferred.

30. All whom God wills to save by Jesus Christ, are infallibly saved.

31. The desires of Christ always produce effect. He gives peace in the soul, when He desires it.

32. Jesus Christ gave Himself up to death, in order to deliver forever by His blood the *first born*, that is, the *elect*, from the hand of the destroying angel.

33. One must renounce the world and self, in order to have confidence if I may so say, to appropriate to one's self Christ Jesus, His love, death and mysteries; as Saint Paul does, when he says, Who loved *me* and gave himself for *me*.

34. The Grace of Adam produced only human merits.

35. The Grace of Adam was a consequence of his creation, and arose from his sound and uncorrupted nature.

36. The essential difference between the Grace of Adam, or of the state of innocence, and Christian Grace, is, that each individual was to receive the former in his own person, but the latter is received only in the person of the risen Saviour, to whom we are united.

37. The Grace of Adam, by sanctifying him in his own person, was proportionate to him; but Christian Grace, whereby we are sanctified in Christ Jesus, is omnipotent, and worthy of the Son of God.

38. The sinner, without the Grace of the Saviour, is not free, except to evil.

39. The will, if not pre-occupied by Grace, has no light, but to err; no ardor, but to run headlong; no strength, but to harm itself. It is capable of all evil, but incapable of any good.

40. Without Grace we can love nothing, but to our condemnation.

41. All knowledge of God, even that which is natural and found in pagan philosophers, can come only from God; and without Grace it produces only presumption, vanity, and opposition to God, instead of affection, adoration, gratitude, and love.

42. It is only the Grace of Christ that prepares a man for the sacrifice of faith; without it, all is impurity and unworthiness.

43. The first effect of Baptismal Grace is, to make us die to sin; so that the spirit, heart, and sense shall be no more alive to sin than a dead man is to the things of the world.

44. There are but two kinds of love, whence all our volitions and actions spring,—the love of God, which does all things for the sake of God, and which God rewards; and the love we have for self and the world, which does not refer to God what it ought, and therefore is sinful.

45. As the love of God no longer reigns in the hearts of sinners, it must be that carnal desires reign there, and corrupt all their actions.

46. Cupidity or charity renders the use of the senses good or evil.

47. Obedience to the Law must arise from some source, and that source is charity. When the love of God is its moving principle, and the glory of God its end, then what appears outwardly is pure; otherwise there is only hypocrisy and spurious righteousness.

48. What else can we be but darkness, but aberration, but sin; without the light of faith, without Christ, without charity!

49. As there is no sin without self-love, so there is no good work without the love of God.

50. In vain we call God our Father, if it is not the spirit of love that prompts us.

51. Faith justifies, when it is operative; but it works only by love.

52. All the other mediums of salvation are contained in faith, as in their germ or seed; but this faith is not without love and confidence.

53. Charity alone acts in a Christian manner in relation to God and Jesus Christ.

54. It is charity that looks up to God; and *that* alone God rewards.

55. God crowns nothing but charity ; whoever is actuated by other impulses and other motives, runs in vain.

56. God rewards only charity, because charity alone honors God.

57. The sinner lacks everything when he lacks hope : but there is no hope in God, where there is no love to Him.

58. There is neither God nor religion where there is no charity.

59. The prayer of the wicked is a new sin ; and what God sends them is a new judgment upon them.

60. If only the fear of punishment animates penitence, the stronger it is, the more it leads to desperation.

61. Fear only restrains the hand, while the heart is led by sin, so long as it is not led by the love of righteousness.

62. He who abstains from evil only from fear of punishment, commits it in his heart, and is guilty before God.

63. A baptized person is still under the Law like a Jew, if he does not obey the Law, or if he obeys it only from fear.

64. Under the maledictions of the Law no good thing is done ; because the person sins either by doing evil, or by avoiding it only from fear.

65. Moses, the prophets, priests, and doctors of the Law, all died without giving one son to God ; because they produced only slaves, acting from fear.

66. Those who would come to God, must not come with animal passions, nor be led by natural instincts, or by fear, like brutes ; but by faith and love, like children.

67. Servile fear depicts God as being only a hard, imperious, unmanageable master.

68. The goodness of God hath made short the way of salvation, by including the whole in faith and prayer.

69. Faith, its exercise, increase, and reward, are all the gift of God's pure liberality.

70. God never afflicts the innocent ; and afflictions always serve either to punish sin, or to purify the sinner.

71. Self-preservation will justify neglect of laws which God enacted for man's utility.

72. The mark of the Christian Church is, that it is universal, comprehending all the angels of heaven, and all the elect and righteous on earth in all ages.

73. What is the Church, but the company of the children of God, abiding in His bosom, adopted in Christ, subsisting in His person, redeemed by His blood, living by His Spirit, acting by His grace, and waiting for the grace of the world to come ?

74. The Church, or entire Christ, has the incarnate Word for its head, and all true saints for its members.

75. The Church is one only man, composed of many members, of which Christ is the head, life, subsistence, and person ; one only Christ, composed of many saints, of whom He is the Sanctifier.

76. Nothing is more spacious than the Church of God ; because all the elected righteous of all ages belong to it.

77. Whoever does not live the life of a child of God and a member of Christ, ceases in reality to have God for his father and Christ for his head.

78. One is severed from the elect people, of whom the Jewish nation was a figure, and Jesus Christ is the head, as well by not *living* according to the Gospel, as by not believing it.

79. It is useful and necessary, at all times, in all places, and for every class of persons, to study and learn the spirit, the piety, and the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures.

80. The perusal of the Scripture is for *all* persons.

81. The holy obscurity of the Word of God is not a reason why the laity should excuse themselves from reading it.

82. The Lord's Day should be sanctified by reading pious books, and especially the Holy Scriptures. It is pernicious to wish to debar a Christian such reading.

83. It is a delusion to suppose that a knowledge of the mysteries of religion should not be communicated to females, by their reading the Holy Scriptures. Not the simplicity of women, but the arrogant knowledge of men has caused the abuse of the Scriptures, and given rise to heresies.

84. To pluck the New Testament out of the hands of Christians, or to hold it alone before them, by depriving them of the means of understanding it, is to stop the mouth of Christ as to them.

85. To interdict Christians the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and especially of the Gospel, is to interdict the children of light the use of light, and to subject them to a sort of excommunication.

86. To deprive the common people of the pleasure of uniting their voice with that of the whole Church, is contrary to apostolical practice and to the intention of God.

87. It is a method full of wisdom, light, and charity, to allow souls time for humiliation, for realizing their state of sin, for praying for a spirit of contrition and penitence, and for at least beginning to live holy lives, *before* their admission to the Sacraments.

88. We do not know what sin and true repentance are, when we wish to be restored *forthwith* to those privileges of which sin had deprived us, and are unwilling to bear the shame of separation.

89. The fourteenth step in a sinner's conversion is, that being *now reconciled*, he has the right of attending the sacrifice of the Church.

90. The Church has authority to excommunicate; which it is to exercise through the primary pastors, with the consent, at least presumed, of the whole body.

91. The fear of an unjust excommunication ought never to deter us from doing our duty. We never go out of the Church, not even when we are visibly expelled from it by the wickedness of men, so long as we remain united to God, to Jesus Christ, and to the Church, by charity.

92. Patiently to suffer excommunication and anathemas, rather than to give up the truth, is to imitate St. Paul: so far is it from rising up against authority and rending union.



93. Jesus sometimes heals the wounds, which the precipitancy of the primary pastors inflicts without His command. Jesus restores what they in their inconsiderate zeal rescind.

94. Nothing gives the enemies of the Church a worse opinion of it, than to see their dominion exercised over the *faith* of believers, and divisions fomented on account of things that harm neither faith nor morals.

95. [Divine] truths have come to be a kind of foreign tongue to most Christians; and the mode of preaching them is almost an unknown language, it is so remote from apostolic simplicity, and so much above the common understanding of the faithful. Nor is it duly considered, that this defect is one of the most visible signs of the old age of the Church and of the anger of God against His children.

96. God permits all the powers to oppose the preachers of the truth, that its victory may be ascribed solely to His Grace.

97. It too often happens, that members the most devoutly and the most strictly united to the Church, are regarded and treated as unworthy to be in it, or as being severed from it. But the just lives by faith, and not by the opinion of men.

98. The state of persecution and punishment, which one endures as a heretic or as a flagitious and wicked man, frequently becomes his ultimate probation, and is most meritorious, as it makes him more conformable to Jesus Christ.

99. Obstinaey, prejudice, and a pertinacious refusal either to examine things or to acknowledge their former mistakes, are, as to many, daily changing into a savor of death, what God has placed in His Church to be there a savor of life; e. g. good books, instructions, holy examples, &c.

100. Deplorable the time, when men think to honor God by persecuting the truth and its followers. This time is come.—To be accounted and treated by the ministers of God as impious and unworthy of all intercourse with God, as being a rotten member capable of spreading corruption through the whole body of saints, is to pious persons a *death* more terrible than that of the body. In vain does a man flatter himself with the purity of his intentions and with his zeal for religion, while persecuting with fire and sword honest men, if he is so blinded by his own passions, or so borne on by those of others, that he will make no examination. We frequently suppose that we sacrifice a *sinner* to God, when we sacrifice one of his servants to the devil.

101. Nothing is more opposed to the spirit of God and to the doctrine of Jesus Christ, than to make *oaths* common in the Church; because this is to multiply occasions of perjury, to lay snares for the weak and simple, and often to render the name and the truth of God subservient to the designs of wicked men.

§ 5. After attending carefully to the opinions of the examining Cardinals and doctors, and after private and public supplications for light and guidance, says the pontiff, "We, by this constitution of perpetual obligation, pronounce, condemn, and reprobate all and every of the preceding propositions, as being false, deceptive, ill sounding, offensive to

pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and to its usages, reproachful not only to the Church but to secular powers, seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy, and also savoring of heresy, and affording countenance to heretics, to heresies and schisms, erroneous, bordering on heresy, often condemned heretofore, and finally, as being heretical, and manifestly recalling respectively various heresies, and especially those contained in the famous propositions of Jansenius, taken in the sense in which they were condemned."

§ 6. All persons are forbidden to think or teach contrary to this bull, or to inculcate or defend, or even to publish, any one or more of these propositions, on pain of the ecclesiastical penalties in such cases provided.

§ 7. This enumeration of distinct passages is not to be construed into an approbation of the residue of the book; for it contains more passages like to these, or otherwise reprehensible.

§ 8. All persons are utterly forbidden to read or to circulate the book.

§ 9, 10, 11, relate to the publication and execution of the bull; and are in the usual form.\*

When the bull arrived in France, the Council of State pronounced it not inconsistent with the liberties of the Gallican Church, and the King caused an assembly of Cardinals, Archbishops, and other potentates to be collected to approve and adopt it. The assembly voted to keep their proceedings secret; they hesitated on Article 30; doubted on some others; wished for a fuller exposition of several points; and disagreed respecting the course they should pursue. In the meantime, the Pope sent the bull all over Roman Catholic Europe. In Germany, it was received without opposition. In the Netherlands, it did not go down so well. In December, the King commanded the assembled French prelates immediately to accept the bull, without limitation or condition. But they continued to deliberate.† Noailles and others persevered in the resolution to accept the bull only with explanations softening its harsher features; but the majority were now for a simple acceptance. Noailles and his party then proposed to retire from the Synod; but the King forbid it. On the 25th of January, 1714, the assembly voted, forty to ten, to accept the bull absolutely, and to recommend its adoption and enforcement in every Diocese. Noailles and nine other Prelates, who formed the opposition, proposed to write a joint letter to the Pope stating their own views: but this the King prohibited. Noailles, however, ventured to write in his own name, and was forbidden by the court; the other dissenting Bishops were also

\* Bullar. Magn. T. VIII, p. 118, &c.

† *Fleurys*, continuat., Vol. LXVIII, pp. 501-518.

remanded to their Sees. In February, the King ordered the result of the Synod to be published; and issued a decree for the universal reception of the bull. His cabinet were not unanimous; and the Parliament hesitated to enroll his decree. He next ordered the Sorbonists to conform to the bull, in all their lectures and discussions: and Noailles issued a pastoral letter, forbidding the circulation of Quesnel's New Testament, and representing the bull as in general correct, though needing explanations, which would best come from the Pope himself. This pastoral gave offense to the King; and he wrote again, more peremptorily, to the hesitating and divided Sorbonists. By a major vote, they finally accepted the bull; and the dissentients were excluded from the faculty by a royal mandate. In all France, one hundred and twelve Bishops adopted the bull; and fifteen insisted that it should first be explained and made definite. The Jansenists made great exertions to support their cause; but they were borne down by the arm of power. The Pope not only urged the King to use compulsion with the dissentients, but himself passed censure on the pastoral letters of the non-accepting Bishops, and requested that Noailles might be sent to Rome to answer for his conduct. Noailles, however, was suffered to remain at home, upon his friends interceding with the King, and on his promising to issue a less offensive pastoral.\* Near the close of the year, it was proposed to assemble a National Council in France, to compose the public commotions; and the King sent an envoy to Rome to consult the Pontiff on the subject. But the Pope disapproved of the project; and supposed that himself and the King, by the reasonable application of arguments and coercion, could bring Noailles and the other recusants to submission. The King, however, did not abandon the idea of a National Council, and several months passed in consultations and in forming plans to subdue the firm and resolute Noailles. At length, when Louis XIV had resolved to put forth all his power to crush the Jansenists at once, on the 1st of September, 1715, he died, and was succeeded by his grandson, Louis XV, a child five years old, with the Duke of Orleans for Regent.†

Instantly, on the accession of Louis XV, the whole face of things was changed. Jesuit influence ceased, the Jansenists came forth boldly, those in exile returned, Noailles was again admitted to court, and made President of the Senate of Conscience, and new opposers of the bull appeared on every side.‡

\* *Fleury*, continuat., Vol. LXVIII, pp. 584-670.

† *Ib.*, Vol. LXIX, pp. 23-50.

‡ *Ib.*, Vol. LXIX, pp. 70-118.

In January, 1716, the Sorbonists blotted out the record of their former acceptance of the bull, and expelled from their sessions the twenty-two members who opposed the measure. The theological faculties of Nantes and of Rheims likewise revoked their former acceptance. The presses teemed with publications on the subject. Against so numerous and powerful opposers, the Pontiff hesitated what to do. He determined, however, to confirm no more French Bishops who did not cordially accept his bull; and he threatened to degrade Noailles from the Cardinalship. In the meantime, the Sorbonists published a long and lucid confutation of the bull: and the Parliaments of Paris, Normandy, Burgundy, Metz, Toulouse, Brittany, and others, decreed that no French Bishop should receive any papal bull or letter, unless it was first approved by the King. Noailles induced the Regent to remove Jesuit confessors from the person of the young King: and himself forbid any Jesuit to preach or to hear Confessions in the Diocese of Paris. A decree was likewise made, that all ecclesiastical causes should, in the last resort, be tried before the Senate of Conscience, of which Noailles was the President.\*

In the year 1717, after long but fruitless efforts for a compromise among the disagreeing prelates, four of the Jansenist Bishops, namely, those of Mirepoix, Montpellier, Boulogne, and Sens, on the first of March, solemnly appealed from the Pope's bull to a future General Council; before which they engaged to prove that the bull, by condemning some of the Quesnelian propositions, sapped the foundations of ecclesiastical order; e. g. in prop. 90, 91, 92:—that in others, it subverted the true doctrine of penance; e. g. prop. 87, 88:—and that in others it destroyed the foundation of good morals and piety; e. g. prop. 44, 27, 12. The Sorbonists also voted to join in the appeal; and likewise the whole university of Rheims, and the theological faculty of Nantes. After this, appellants multiplied rapidly among the ecclesiastics, and especially at Paris, Rheims, Orleans, and Rouen. Several of the Bishops appealed; and at length Archbishop Noailles. On the other hand, the accepting Bishops petitioned the Regent to make it penal for any person to appeal, and to forbid the circulation of all tracts favoring appellancy. The Pope was confounded. At first he thought of allowing some explanation of his bull; but altering his purpose, he commenced negotiations with the Regent respecting future measures, and agreed, that in the first place they should command both parties to be

---

\* *Fleury*, continuat., Vol. LXIX, pp. 167–358.

silent. But appeals continued still to multiply ; and among others, Quesnel himself published an appeal from the Pope, misguided by Jesuit influence.\* In February, 1718, the inquisition at Rome condemned several appeals of the French Bishops, as being seditious and heretical pamphlets ; and the Pope accompanied this proscription with a letter under his own hand. But the Parliament of Paris, and seven other Parliaments, condemned the papal letter, and forbid its circulation in France. The September following, the Pope resolved to adopt stronger measures, and therefore issued his bull, called *Pastoralis Officii*,† in which he warns all opposers of the bull *Unigenitus* of their great wickedness in resisting the supreme authority of the Church, and declares, that unless they repent and submit unconditionally to the bull, they must all be considered and treated as no longer members of the Church. About the same time, Noailles laid his appeal, before his clergy ; and they voted their entire accordance with it.‡ The Sorbonists also supported Noailles with all their influence ; and likewise published an appeal in their own name. A cabinet council, after deliberating on the bull *Pastoralis Officii*, agreed to refer it to the consideration of the Parliament of Paris ; and that body pronounced it to be arrogant, irregular, and of no validity ; because the Pope has not power, by his sole authority, to decree Articles of Faith, nor can he try and condemn French Bishops in his court at Rome, and much less, without any citation or regular process. Noailles likewise issued a pastoral letter to his Clergy, in which he exhorts them to obey the Pope, so far as he may decide aright and keep within his own province ; he moreover renewed his appeal to a General Council, from both the papal bulls.

On the other hand, more than fifty accepting Bishops published injunctions in favor of the bulls ; but not without censure from several Parliaments. The Regent labored to abate the strife, and endeavored to weigh the conduct of both parties in an even balance. The whole University of Paris now appealed ; and the theological faculty stated at large their objections to the bull *Unigenitus*. The hesitating Pontiff at length proposed to consider the objections raised against his bull, and to admit some explanation of the latter, provided the appellants would pledge themselves to recall their appeals and to accept the bull.§ About this time, it is said, the Quesnelists

\* *Fleury*, Vol. LXIX, pp. 448-601.

† Bullar. Magn. Tom. viii, p. 205.

‡ *Fleury*, continuat., Vol. LXIX, pp. 694-751.

§ *Ib.*, Vol. LXX, pp. 1-214.

thought of separating from the Romish Church, or of forming themselves into a distinct sect of Reformed Catholics.\* The Bishops and the Parliaments continued to issue their odious decrees ; and the generals of all the Monastic Orders, (except the Benedictines of St. Maur,) coerced their appellant monks with punishments, till they compelled them to submit to the bull. Various plans for a compromise were again discussed ; and the Regent once more enjoined silence on the parties.† In the year 1720, about ninety accepting Bishops with their clergy agreed upon an exposition of the bull, which Noailles declared he could accept. Prompted by this movement, the Archbishop published in the month of August, an elaborate exposition of what he considered to be the Catholic Faith on all the points in dispute, stating distinctly what was true and what was not so ; and then on the assumption that the bull was intended to convey the same views as he had just expressed, he declared his acceptance of it, and his condemnation of the propositions which were therein condemned. For an adjustment of the controversy in this way, he was eager, and urged the Regent to enforce it. But neither the Pontiff, nor the more strenuous Jansenists at Paris, would agree to this pacification.

Things were in this state when, in March, 1721, Pope Clement XI died, and transmitted this protracted and ill-managed controversy to his successor.‡

---

\* *Fleury*, continuat., Vol. LXX, pp. 218-222. † *Ib.*, Vol. LXX, pp. 223-262.

‡ *Ib.*, Vol. LXX, pp. 454-573.

## ART. VI.—THE ROCK.

*An Exegesis of St. Matthew XVI, 15—19.*

This passage has been very much involved in controversy. It would be difficult to frame a new exposition of any of the clauses in this celebrated passage, upon which such a multitude of commentators have exhausted their learning and their ingenuity. Yet one, who examines the passage now, with all the helps presented by the investigations of former critics, may be able, by carefully applying the well established principles of hermeneutics to the expositions already proposed, to cull from them the most sensible interpretations of the several clauses, and to combine from them all an exegesis of the whole passage which shall commend itself to the sober judgment of honest and reasonable enquirers. To do this will be our effort in the present Article. Our great difficulty is in the necessity of compressing within narrow limits the needful comments upon a topic on which so much has been and may be said. And if, in reference to some of the numerous points suggested, we may seem to speak too briefly, our apology must be found in the necessity just alluded to.

The passage is as follows:

“He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.”

As we read these verses, the first thing which attracts our attention is the remarkable confession of St. Peter, in regard to the character and claims of the Saviour. The confession was introduced by questions put by our Lord to His disciples in reference to himself. St. Matthew thus describes the conversation: “When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Phillippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? (or as some for critical reasons



prefer another reading, "Who, do men say, is the Son of Man?") And they said, some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets." (xvi, 13—14.) The phrase, "say that thou art," in this verse, is not in the original, and is, therefore, according to the custom of our translators, printed in italics; so that the verse may read appropriately to either form of the question; "Some, John the Baptist, some Elias," &c. In contrast with this enquiry in regard to the opinions of others, He puts next, the question in relation to their own views: "He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am?" (vs. 15.) And here we meet the memorable confession of the son of Jonas: "And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," (vs. 16.) In the parallel passage of St. Mark it is thus recorded: "And Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ." (St. Mark viii, 29.) And in the parallel passage of St. Luke, it reads: "Peter answering said, The Christ of God." (St. Luke ix, 20.)

At this point, with this brief statement of St. Peter's confession, both St. Mark and St. Luke close their narratives of this conversation, St. Mark adding immediately: "And he charged them that they should tell no man of him," (vii, 30.) And St. Luke, also, adding immediately: "And he straitly charged them and commanded them to tell no man that thing;" (ix, 21;) while, on the other hand, St. Matthew adds, after this confession, in the three long verses—the 17th, 18th, 19th—the full subsequent reply of Christ to Peter, after which he closes with a statement similar to that of the other two Evangelists: "Then charged he His disciples that they should tell no man that He was Jesus the Christ," (xvi, 20.) The verses in controversy are recorded only by St. Matthew. And it is remarkable, that they are not preserved by the other Evangelists in their parallel narratives. We call attention to this fact, as we proceed, since we shall refer to it in another part of our argument, before we close.

The peculiar import and force of the confession of St. Peter are, that Christ is the Messiah, with all that was implied in that title to the mind of a pious Jew who had been educated in the earlier and sounder traditional expectations of his nation: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Whitby, as Dr. Bloomfield remarks, "supposes that there was this difference between ὁ Χριστός, and ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, that the former referred to his office, the latter to his Divine original; though he admits, that neither Nathanael (John i, 49) nor the other Jews, nor even the Apostles, used it in that sublime sense in which

Christians always take it," (*in loc.*) Learned men who have investigated the opinions of the Jews at and before the times of Christ, tell us that the Jews expected a Divine Messiah—not a mere man, but one who, in the dignity of both the Divine and human nature, should rule over their nation. He was to be the Son of the Most High, while, at the same time, He was to be the Son of David; and therefore the Messiah was spoken of by both the titles, "the Son of man" and "the Son of God." (See Horsley's sermon on this text.) The ordinary commentaries illustrate the ancient Jewish views to some extent; but, if one would wish to see the sentiments of the Jewish doctors in regard to both the Divine and human nature of their anticipated Messiah exhibited at length, he will find, in the work of the Rev. John Oxlee on the "Trinity and Incarnation considered and maintained on the principles of Judaism," a vast deal of curious and interesting information, collected, with great industry, out of the mystic arcana of Rabbinical lore. The Hebrew commentators of that early period, reading the prophecies in their natural sense, and guided, too, without doubt, by the traditions which came from the very times of the prophets, had far more accurate views of the exalted nature of the Messiah, than the Hebrew critics of a later period, who were swayed by their prejudices against Christianity, as well as by the unhappy political circumstances of their nation. The later critics labored to prove the coming of a mere temporal Messiah, a conqueror of nations, a liberator of the descendants of Abraham, while their earlier commentators recognized the Divine character of the Messiah and the spiritual character of his government. In this sense, which the pious Jews of the time of Christ acknowledged, (as did Simeon and Anna in the Temple, and Zacharias and Elizabeth in their home,) in this sense the confession of St. Peter was made, using the very titles of the Messiah which denoted His highest dignity: "Thou, the Son of Man, (this title implied from the question of Christ to which this was the direct reply,) art the Christ—the long-expected Messiah—the Son—the Only Begotten Son—of the only living and true God."

This confession of St. Peter was received and approved by our Saviour, as the broad and unequivocal acknowledgment of Him in His Office as the Divine Messiah for the salvation and government of mankind; for, continues St. Matthew, "Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona (i.e. Son of Jonas:) for flesh and blood hath not revealed it (i.e., the great truth just confessed) unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." (vs. 17.) The meaning is, that St. Peter

was thus led to the knowledge of the great truth which he had asserted, not by his own human intuition or power of reasoning alone, but that he had been guided by the influence of the Holy Spirit of Inspiration, whom the Father sends to guide his people into the truth. Here was a great truth, which the natural heart would be slow to receive and unwilling to acknowledge. Far easier would it have been, more in harmony with other facts in the previous history of the Apostle, if St. Peter had spoken of his Master as a temporal Ruler; for this would have corresponded with the promptings of his unconverted and worldly nature. But when he used the expressions, which told of a higher sense, which implied the spiritual and Divine nature of the Messiah, as a Being for a Holy service and worship, whose kingdom, like that of God His Father, was to be in the heart of men, then he gave proof that God had taught him, then he showed that "flesh and blood had not revealed it unto him, but the Father which is in heaven."

It has been a question among expositors, whether, in this confession, St. Peter spake for himself only, or whether he spake as the representative and spokesman of the twelve Apostles. St. Chrysostom, St. Cyprian and St. Jerome among the ancients, and among the moderns, Scott, Doddridge, Bloomfield, and a host of others, maintain the latter view; while Bishop Horsley, Dr. Whitby, and many other distinguished critics among the moderns, advocate the former view. The former view seems to us the correct view. For while, in answer to the first question, "Whom do men say that I am?" (v. 13,) St. Matthew writes: "And they said, (meaning that all the Apostles replied for themselves,) some, John the Baptist, some Elias," &c., he declares distinctly, that in answer to the second question, "Whom say ye that I am?" the reply was made only by Peter: "And Simon Peter answered," &c.; and there is nothing, either in the statement of the Evangelist, or in the form of the reply, to indicate that he spake for any but himself. And the reply of our Saviour being directed emphatically, in the second person throughout, to St. Peter, proves that the speech of St. Peter was for himself. This view is further strengthened by the fact that on two previous occasions, where the Apostles did make this confession, the language of the narrative is clear. Thus, in St. Matthew xiv, 33, it is stated, concerning the disciples, on their deliverance from the storm: "Then they that were in the ship came and worshiped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God." And in St. John vi, 67-69, just before this great confession of St. Peter, upon which we are commenting, (Bishop Horsley makes it

subsequent to this, but the Harmonists, Doddridge, Townsend, and Dr. Jarvis, place it before this,) St. Peter asserted the same confession, evidently (as Horsley admits) as the mouth-piece or spokesman for all the Apostles: "Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go?—thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe, and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." As the construction of these passages shows, that in one of them the Apostles spake directly for themselves, and that, in the other, St. Peter spake in their behalf, as their representative; so the construction of the passage upon which we are now commenting shows that St. Peter spake for himself alone,—that, although doubtless he expressed the views which they held in common with himself, yet he did not speak particularly as their representative, but upon the impulse of his own ardent faith, for himself.

It has also been a question among commentators, whether our Lord's reply was addressed to St. Peter personally, or to him as the representative of all the Apostles. The former view is maintained by Grotius, Whitby, Pearson, Horsley, Doddridge, and many others; and the latter view by Dr. Isaac Barrow, (who also declares that "the Fathers interpret it, not personally, but representatively," in his sermon on "The Power of the Keys,") by Dr. George Campbell, (who qualifies his statement: "Though we are taught from Scripture to consider the declarations made to Peter as being also applicable to them all, still they are to be regarded as being most eminently applicable to him," in his fifth lecture,) by Dr. Thomas Scott and many others. We adopt the former view, and are compelled to do so, from a comparison of the passage with others, and from the unequivocal construction of the passage, which forbids the idea of representation, and makes St. Peter individually the person addressed.

"And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (vs. 18-19.) These are the verses which are involved in the most important controversy. We shall consider them, clause by clause.

"And I say also unto thee." The particles "and" and "also," in this clause, prove the connection of what follows this with the confession of St. Peter in the sixteenth verse. The intermediate clause in the seventeenth verse: "Blessed

art thou, Simon Barjona ; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven," has the nature of an independent or parenthetical clause, being simply an ejaculatory benediction, with the reason of the benediction assigned, and forming strictly or logically no part of the formal reply to the confession. The reply strictly commences with this phrase : " And I say also unto thee." The words are pregnant—full of meaning—they include, imply, understand the preceding confession, with which they are grammatically connected by the conjunction " and," and the associated and intensive particle " also;" as if Christ had fully expressed what is implied in the ellipsis : " I assent to thy confession, I re-affirm it, I am the Christ, the Son of the living God, and I say also unto thee, That," &c. This, we contend, is the accurate rendering and sense of the clause. The learned Granville Sharp, and after him, Mr. Townsend, call attention to this point. Dr. Bloomfield also refers to it, and we may quote his authority : " From the very form of expression in *Καγὼ δὲ σοὶ λέγω*, it is plain that what is here said by Christ is meant to correspond to what had been just said by Peter. As he had declared to Jesus : *Σὺ εἶ—ὁ υἱός*, so Jesus says to him : *Καγὼ δὲ σοὶ λέγω*, the sense of which is, " Moreover, I also say to thee," (*in loco*.)

" That thou art Peter, and upon this Rock," &c. The name or title of Peter, *Πέτρος*, was given by our Lord to Simon in the beginning of his discipleship, as related by St. John : " And he (Andrew) brought him (Simon) to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon, the Son of Jona : thou shalt be called Cephas ; which is, by interpretation, a stone, or (M. R.) Peter." The name was given, probably, to indicate the general firmness and strength of the Apostle's character. Frequent and familiar examples of giving names or titles to represent traits or events, (cases of Paronomasia,) occur in both the Old and New Testaments. There is a diversity of opinion as to the meaning of the word *Πέτρος*. Leigh, Scapula, Schrevelius, Dawson, Parkhurst, Sharp, make it to mean a stone, or rock, in a sense inferior to that of the other word, *πέτρα*. Bloomfield, Robinson, Donnegan, assign to it the full sense of Rock. The difference is unimportant. The word translated " Rock," (" upon this rock,") *πέτρα*, all agree, signifies, as translated here, a rock, or ledge, or cliff—a mass of rock—*saxum grande*. Some argue, from this supposed difference of meaning between the two words, that they cannot, therefore, refer to the same thing, but must refer to different things or persons. We think, as we shall presently show, that there are other and

conclusive reasons for applying these two words to different things, and that their identity or diversity in sense is entirely immaterial to the argument. The phrase, "thou art Peter," signifies, "thou art (or denotest, or representest) a stone, or rock"—a common sense of the substantive verb to be, (*Εἰμι*), as in sentences of frequent recurrence.

"Upon this rock I will build my Church;" ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ—"upon this very rock." What is referred to by "this Rock?" Was St. Peter himself the Rock?—Or was his confession (the great truth and fact in that confession) the Rock. Dr. Doddridge, in his paraphrase, as well as some others, seems to unite the two, as if both Peter and his faith in his confession, were the Rock. This sort of interpretation, which gives several different meanings to the same word, in the same place and at the same time, as was the fashion a century ago, after the example of the famous Cocceius of Leyden, we reject; since it is an established rule of hermeneutics, (see Horne, Ernesti, &c.,) that every word (except, perhaps, in prophetic language) in common language, has not only some meaning, but only one true sense, in the same place and time. It is but just to say that Dr. Doddridge, in his note, gives a single sense to the word, applying it to St. Peter himself. Whitby, Grotius, Hammond, Barrow, Bishop Marsh, Campbell, Michaelis, Bloomfield, T. H. Horne and others, suppose that by "the Rock" here, St. Peter is intended. The Early Fathers, on the other hand, almost unanimously, suppose "the Rock" to be the confession or faith of St. Peter, or Christ himself, the great fact or truth in that confession, "which, indeed," as Bishop Burnet remarks, "is but a different way of expressing the same thing." Beza supposes it to be Christ, or the confession of Peter; Lightfoot, Scott, Horsley, Granville Sharp, Townsend, and others, suppose "the Rock" to be the confession of St. Peter. This is the view which we maintain, and will endeavor to illustrate by two or three considerations.

First, we argue, that the confession is here referred to from the opening clause of the verse: "And I also say unto thee." This clause necessarily refers back to the confession, brings it forward and connects it with the present verse. It shows that the confession is included in this verse, is necessary to give meaning to this verse, that this verse follows, in its sense, from that confession, and is dependent upon it. "And I also say unto thee," in reference to this great fundamental and essential truth which thou hast just confessed, that "thou art a stone or rock, (*Πέτρος*), and as thy name denotes and suggests a Rock, so upon the truth in this thy confession as upon a Rock—"upon

this very rock" (*πετρα*) of my Messiahship confessed by thee, "I will build my Church." The remarks of Mr. Sharp, as condensed by Mr. Townsend, express the argument very clearly:

"The application of this supreme title (the rock) to Peter is inconsistent, above all, with the plain reference to the preceding context, made by our Lord in the beginning of this very verse—'And I also say unto thee,' which manifestly points out, both by the copulative 'and,' and the connective adverb 'also,' the inseparable connection of this verse with the previous declaration of Peter, concerning our Lord's Divine dignity in the preceding sentence, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;' and thereby demonstrates that our Lord's immediate reply, ('And I also say unto thee,' &c.,) did necessarily include this declaration of Peter, as being the principal object of the sentence—the true foundation or rock, on which alone the Catholic Church can be properly built, because our faith in Christ (that He is truly 'the Son of the living God') is unquestionably the only security, or rock, of our salvation."\*

Secondly, we argue, that the confession (i. e. the great fact of Christ's Divine Messiahship asserted in it) is here referred to, from the evidently designed distinction between the words *πετρος* and *πετρα* employed by our Lord. Certainly, this distinction, in our Lord's well-weighed and solemn address to His Apostle, was not accidental. If our Lord had meant to refer to the very same things or persons in these two words, He would have used the same word. If He had meant Peter in both these near and connected clauses, He would have said "Peter" in both. This would have made the sense clear, and have avoided all doubts of his meaning—this would have been according to the common laws of language. His deliberate selection of different words shows that He intended a distinction, that He did not mean the same thing. The name of Peter, signifying a "Rock or Stone," is *πετρος*, in the masculine gender, while the word, translated "Rock," in the text, is *πετρα*, in another gender. If our Lord had meant to indicate St. Peter himself by the "Rock," He would not have changed to another word; and the argument is even more forcible, if we admit that the two words are precisely synonymous in their signification, and that *πετρος* is as strong a word as *πετρα*. He would have continued the same word *πετρος* into the following clause, and thus have shown, while still retaining the same strength of expression, that the same person was intended. Whereas, by using another word, by changing His expression, He shows that He does not mean to refer to Peter, but to another idea suggested by the name of Peter; as if He had

---

\* Part IV, Note 18.



said: "Thou art one rock, as thy name imports, and upon another rock, this other rock of the confession which thou hast made, and which is the subject of my remarks, I will build my Church." This argument, so directly appealing to our reason and common sense, so perfectly consistent with all the usages of spoken language, has never been answered, and, we think, is entirely unanswerable. Mr. Sharp thus concisely presents it: "I have already remarked, that *πετρα*, a rock, is a feminine noun; and a clear distinction is maintained between *πετρος*, the masculine noun in this text, and the said feminine noun *πετρα*, the rock, by the grammatical terms in which the latter, in its relatives and articles, is expressed, which are all regularly feminine throughout the whole sentence, and thereby they demonstrate that our Lord did not intend that the new appellation or nominal distinction, which he had just before given to Simon, (viz, *πετρος*, the masculine noun in the beginning of the sentence,) should be construed as the character of which he spoke in the next part of the sentence; for, if he had really intended that construction, the same masculine noun, *πετρος*, must necessarily have been repeated in the next part of the sentence with a masculine pronoun, viz, *ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πετρῷ*, instead of *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πετρᾷ*, the present text; wherein, on the contrary, the gender is changed from the masculine to the feminine . . . so that the application to Peter, (or *πετρος*,) as the foundation of Christ's Church, is inconsistent with the necessary grammatical construction," &c.\*

Thirdly, we argue, that the great fact of Christ's Divine Messiaship in the confession, is here referred to from the invariable usage in the New Testament. The word *πετρος* is never used in the New Testament except as the appellative of Simon Peter. The word *πετρα*, on the other hand, is frequently used, and wherever applied to a person, is, without exception, applied to Christ. Turning to a Greek concordance, we see this at a glance. In Romans ix, 33, Christ is referred to as the "Rock (*πετρα*) of offense," (a reference to Ps. cxviii, 22, and to Isaiah viii, 14, and xxviii, 16.) In 1st Peter ii, 8, where the reference is to the same passages, Christ is again spoken of as the "Rock (*πετρα*) of offense." In the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, Christ is twice referred to by this word: "For they drank of that spiritual Rock (*πετρα*) that followed them; and that Rock (*πετρα*) was Christ," x, 4. Now, when, in this contested passage, the question is, whether the word *πετρα* applies to Christ or to Peter, and we find, that Peter is always, everywhere else,

---

\* Townsend, Part IV, Note 18.

referred to by the word *πετρος*, and never by the word *πετρα*; while, on the other hand, the word *πετρα*, everywhere else, when applied to persons, is always, in several places, and without exception, applied to Christ, and to no other person, is not the conclusion inevitable, that, if any person be intended by it here, it must be Christ, and not Peter? To decide differently would be to violate one of the first and plainest principles of hermeneutics.

Fourthly, we argue, that the confession of Christ's Divine Messiahship is here referred to, from the analogy of faith. This is a very important rule of interpretation when rightly used. It is the applying to doubtful passages, for their elucidation, the general and established and undoubted sense of other passages, on the manifest principle that the teachings of Scripture are not contradictory but consistent with themselves. Now here is, we suppose, a doubtful passage, in which a rock—a single Rock—is spoken of as the one foundation, on which the Church in all ages is to be built, ("I will build,") on which all the disciples of Christ are to be gathered and edified unto the end of the world. Now what clear and unequivocal passages, analogous to this, which speak of such one foundation, are there which illustrate and determine the sense of this? We turn to 1 Cor. iii, 11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." We turn to Eph. ii, 20-22: "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; In whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord, In whom ye also are builded together, for an habitation of God through the Spirit." We turn to Ephesians iv, 15-16: "The Head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly framed together and compacted, . . . maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love;" to 1 Cor. iii, 9: "Ye are God's husbandry; ye are God's building;" to Jude xx: "Building up yourselves on your most holy faith." Other passages, as Revelation xxi, 14: "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb;" and Ephesians ii, 20: "The foundation of the Apostles and Prophets;" where several subordinate foundations are referred to, are not analogous to this of our text, where only one great foundation-Rock is referred to. The argument from the analogy of faith is this—everywhere else, in the Scriptures, where one foundation of the Church is referred to, Christ is asserted as that one foundation; therefore, this Rock, in our text, which is spoken of as the one foundation of the Universal Church, must be interpreted of Christ. This is logical.

Fifthly, we are confirmed in the view which we have presented, by the testimony of the Early Christian Fathers. Barrow, Burnet, and others, tell us, that the Fathers, almost without exception, interpret "the Rock," in this passage, of Peter's confession, or of his faith in it, or of Christ confessed in it, and not of Peter personally. Now the Fathers are invaluable witnesses to the doctrines or facts received in their age, and thus help us to establish, upon the most thorough and credible evidence, the Apostolic Faith and Institutions, against all disputers. But, as individual interpreters of particular passages, they stand upon the same ground, *cæteris paribus*, with other uninspired interpreters, and are to be judged of according to the merit of their several expositions. When they testify, we submit to their evidence; when they argue with us, we criticise their arguments. If one, or several, or all of them should interpret a particular passage, against the clearly ascertained *usus loquendi*, or against the clear analogy of faith, we should reject their interpretation, as we should that of any other interpreters, who should fall into a similar error; for the true *usus loquendi* is the great object sought in interpreting, and a departure from the analogy of faith, which would make the Scriptures self-contradictory, would be a manifest absurdity.\* But where the sense of the passage is doubtful, and the Fathers generally unite in an interpretation, not inconsistent with the known meaning of the words, nor with the general teachings of the Scriptures, and where they are evidently not warped by any unconscious influence of any erroneous current maxim peculiar to their age and social state, then their unanimity in the interpretation of a particular passage, is a powerful evidence of the true *usus loquendi* in the times nearest to those when the Scriptures were written, and would go far to settle a question equally balanced in other respects. In this way, we regard their general concurrence in the view which we present of the passage before us as of very great weight in confirming the interpretation.

We have stated our view of this clause, which is the admitted knot of the passage. The view of so many eminent com-

---

\* In the July No. of the Church Review, (1857,) in a paper on "the Spirits in Prison," we had occasion, in the view which we presented, to differ from the interpretation, given generally, but not universally, by the Early Fathers, of 1st Peter iii, 18-20. We did so, because, as we believed, the *usus loquendi*, and the analogy of faith, clearly ruled in that case, against them. In the present case, they are in harmony with these essential elements of interpretation, and thus their testimony is of great value. We may add, that any errors of the Fathers, in the interpretation of particular passages, cannot invalidate the force of their general testimony as to the great doctrines, facts, or institutions of Christianity.

mentators, that by "the Rock" is meant St. Peter personally, although not exclusively, as one of the Apostles, and that our Saviour meant that the Church was to be built upon him as one of the subordinate foundations, certainly, does not imply any error of doctrine, neither does it militate against the soundest Protestantism; and is perfectly consistent with passages (such as Eph. ii, 20, and Rev. xxi, 14) already quoted. But as the construction of the passage does not, as we conceive, warrant this view, we are compelled to reject it, and to prefer that which makes "the Rock," upon which Christ's Catholic Church is builded, to be the glorious fact of the Divine Messiahship of Christ asserted in the noble confession of St. Peter.

We pass on to the other clauses, and shall be able to consider them more rapidly.

"And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." On this clause there is very little difference of opinion among critics. The Eastern cities, being surrounded by walls, and defended at the gates of entrance, the gates also being used as the places where the judges and persons in authority kept their courts, the word "gates" came to signify metaphorically power, and thus "the gates of hell," signify the power of hell. The word "hell," in this passage, is literally Hades, and signifies the grave, or rather, in a broader sense, the state of the dead, the place of departed spirits. By "the gates of hell," then, we are to understand the power of death and the grave. This power, says Christ, shall not prevail against His Church. That is, as His Church is not an abstraction, nor a mere system of doctrines, nor a mere code of institutions, but a collection of living members, redeemed by His blood, sanctified by His Spirit, immortalized by His salvation, therefore, the power of death shall not finally prevail over it to entirely conquer and destroy it—its life shall be sustained, and the congregation of His faithful disciples shall be perpetuated from age to age to the close of time; and the members of His Church, though they die, and go, one by one, into the gates of death, shall be delivered in the general Resurrection, and triumph then over the grave. In the eloquent words of Bishop Horsley: "Our Lord promises, not only perpetuity to the Church, to the last moment of the world's existence, notwithstanding the successive mortality of all its members in all ages, but what is much more, a final triumph over the power of the grave. Firmly as the gates of Hades may be barred, they shall have no power to confine His departed saints, when the last trump shall sound, and the voice of the archangel shall thunder through the deep." (Sermon 13.)

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This whole passage expresses one class of ideas—the clauses are to be taken together—the clauses, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth," &c., being simply exegetical of the first clause, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." The learned Dr. Barrow, in his essay on the Power of the Keys, in his exposition of the Creed, commenting on this first clause, remarks: "For the phrases equivalent, by which, in places of the Gospel most parallel, this power is expressed and explained, they are especially those of 'binding and loosing,' of 'retaining and remitting sins.' As for 'binding and loosing,' when our Saviour had promised to bestow upon St. Peter 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' he signifies what effect the use of them should produce, by adding conjunctively, 'And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and what thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven.'"

One other general remark we may make upon this verse, before we examine it in detail, namely, that we are not to look upon these clauses as being in themselves any more difficult or involved in mystery than any other passages of the Scripture. Our Lord, as did his Apostles after him, used plain language, intelligible to his hearers, or, if at any time he used figurative language, (as in our text,) the figures were such as were familiar to his hearers, and conveyed a sense easily to be understood. All that we have to do is to inquire patiently for the literal, the figurative, or the historical sense, as the case may require. "To think," says Lightfoot, "that Christ, when he used the common phrase, was not understood by his hearers, in the common and vulgar sense, shall I call it a matter of laughter or of madness?"

"I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." By "the kingdom of heaven" is meant the Church which Christ was establishing on earth, with all its privileges and means of grace, to prepare his people for the Church triumphant—the kingdom of heaven above. It is the common usage of our Lord to describe His Church by this expression; as when he likens "the kingdom of heaven" to a net cast into the sea, which enclosed both good fishes and bad, (Matt. xiii, 47-50;) to a field, in which both the good seed and the tares were to grow together until the harvest, (Matt. xiii, 24-30;) to a grain of mustard seed growing into a large tree in which the fowls of the air should lodge, (Matt. xiii, 31-32;) to leaven hid in three

measures of meal till the whole was leavened, (Matt. xiii, 33;) and in many other familiar cases. The phrase is sometimes used in other senses, sometimes the state of eternal glory, sometimes the internal experience of the Christian, sometimes the whole work and dispensation of Christ. But here it evidently means the Church, of which He had just before spoken, and to which the subsequent clauses plainly apply.

The "giving of the keys" denotes the imparting of authority. "I have the keys of hell and of death," says Christ, (Rev. i, 18,) that is, "I have authority over Hades and death." In the Old Testament, "the key of the house of David" (Isaiah xxii, 22) is used to denote authority or government over the house of David, or the authority of the royal family over Israel. It is merely a figurative mode of expressing a right or power to govern. As the key is the instrument which unlocks or locks the door, it is employed as the symbol of power. He who has the keys of a house has an ownership or right of control in the house. So in the common usage of men, founded upon this ancient and universal symbol, to "give the keys" is to yield possession or to impart authority. This is the sense in which almost all critics and divines understand the power of the keys—government over the Church and the regulation of its affairs, as is more fully explained in the subsequent clauses of the verse.

To this sense so generally admitted, many expositors, both ancient and modern, add another. They suppose that, in "the giving of the keys" to Peter, our Lord intended a prediction or promise to this Apostle, that he should be the first to open the doors of the Church to men, as the reward of his faith in his Confession. Christ gave to him the privilege of first opening the doors of the Church to men. Whether this sense be also implied in the passage or not, the fact is true that, on the preaching of St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost, the doors of the Church were first opened to the Jews by this Apostle, and that in the conversion of the Roman centurion Cornelius and his household, by St. Peter's preaching, the doors of the Church were first opened to the Gentiles by the same Apostle. This wider sense may be allowable, since the text implies a promise, and all promises are in their nature prophetic; and for the reason also that the power of the keys includes, with other powers, the right of opening the doors of the Church by preaching. Bishop Horsley, however, supposes this latter sense here stated to be the exclusive sense of the power of the keys here given to St. Peter, different from the ordinary power of the keys held afterwards by him and his fellow Apostles; and

for the reason that he seems to suppose that this must have been a gift which the other Apostles could not share.

We admit that the power, whatever it was, given in this whole verse to St. Peter, was for the time exclusively his. Afterwards, it was extended to all the Apostles, as recorded in St. Matt. xviii, 18: "Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." These are the very same words which were spoken to St. Peter in our text, with the exception of the first clause containing the giving of the keys. But as this first clause means simply the same thing as its subsequent exegetical clauses, and as these exegetical clauses are identically the same with the words spoken to all the Apostles, recorded in the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew, therefore the passage in St. Matthew xviii, 18, is the same in meaning with this of our text in the sixteenth chapter, and therefore all the Apostles were, at the later time spoken of in the eighteenth chapter, invested with the same powers which were first given to St. Peter alone, as recorded in our text.

We suggest, with diffidence, what seems to us a reasonable solution of the history, consistent with a fair exegesis of these passages. Was not this act of our Saviour in the text, (Matt. xvi, 19,) the solemn ordination or appointment of St. Peter to his Apostleship, thus making him first and solely an Apostle, giving him this honor as the reward of his zeal and faith? Was not that later act of our Saviour (Matt. xviii, 18) the appointment of all, as the use of the same words implies, to the same and an equal Apostleship? And, (whereas these gifts of office were held in abeyance until after Christ's Resurrection, when the time at length came that the Church was to be established, and the power of "binding and loosing" exercised,) we read that our Saviour did, after His Resurrection, solemnly reaffirm the previous appointments and renew his gift, as St. John records it, (xx, 21-23:) "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." In this view, Peter was first ordained an Apostle, having a precedence in the college of his compeers simply in respect of his seniority in office, and not at all in respect to the nature or rights of office. Does not this view explain easily and naturally that expression (which has so puzzled commentators) in St. Matt. x, 2:



"Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these ; the first (i. e. Apostle) Simon, who is called Peter," &c., (*πρῶτος Σίμων*) ? And does it not make clear many facts in the future history of the Apostles, the precedence accorded to him at certain times, and the co-equality asserted with him at other times ? Does it not give to the passage on which we are commenting its own distinctive peculiarity, and at the same time show it to be in perfect harmony with those later passages which are parallel to it ?

One clause remains to be considered.

"And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This clause is, as we have remarked, exegetical of the previous clause, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." As this clause is identical with that which was applied to all the Apostles, (Matt. xviii, 18,) we will consider them together, remarking that, whatever the meaning of the clause, it applied first, as in the passage before us, to the Apostle Peter, and afterwards to his brethren in the Apostleship. Lightfoot, who paid great attention to the subject and was very learned in Talmudical and Rabbinical literature, tells us that these terms, "to bind" and "to loose," were common among the Jews and well understood. To "bind" signified to prohibit, or to teach what thing is prohibited ; to "loose" was to permit or to teach what thing is permitted. It was a power to change or annul institutions already existing and to establish and create new ones—a general power of government and administration. The power of "remitting and retaining sins" was a different power, the right and authority of publishing Christ's law and its conditions, to declare the conditions of forgiveness and of condemnation, and to exercise discipline in the Church. "Binding and loosing" have reference to laws, institutions, rites ; "remitting and retaining sins" have reference to persons. The Apostles were to carry out the work which Christ had begun. His commission to them was : "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." They were to complete the establishment of the Christian Church. They were to abrogate the requisitions of the Mosaic Law, as the Apostles did at the Council of Jerusalem, (Acts xv,) and as St. Paul did in his Epistles, and as St. Peter did at his visit to Cornelius. They were to establish the institutions of the Christian Dispensation, to make "customs," (1 Cor. xi, 16,) to punish offenders, (1 Cor. v, 1-5, 11,) to use authority, (2 Cor. x, 8.) All things that were not in harmony with the design of Christianity they were to repeal

and remove; and whatsoever they should believe to advance the interests of Christ's kingdom they were to appoint and authorize. They were to fix the institutions of the Christian Church, and to arrange and enforce its discipline, just as Christ would have done had he remained upon earth; and whatsoever they should thus do, in virtue of their commission, was to be approved and authorized in heaven and to have authority as an appointment of God. They were to act for Christ, and therefore were clothed with Christ's authority; and the Father, who sanctioned Him, would also sanction them as His representatives. This is the simple sense of a passage which to many has seemed so mysterious and perplexing.

The passage upon which we have been commenting, is the great proof text, urged by the Church of Rome, to prove the Supremacy of the Popes or Pontiffs, whom they consider as the successors of St. Peter.

Now, even granting, for the occasion, that the passage means all that the Romish writers claim for it, in reference to St. Peter, this would prove nothing for the Bishops of Rome, as there is no positive certainty, that they are the successors of St. Peter in that See. That St. Peter died at Rome, there is no reasonable doubt, as is also true in the case of St. Paul. But that he ever had the peculiar or Diocesan charge of the Church at Rome, as St. James had of that at Jerusalem, there is no sufficient evidence. The learned Dr. Barrow has shown conclusively the exceeding improbability, if not impossibility, of it. If our space had permitted, we should gladly have quoted his argument. We refer the reader particularly to sections 5 and 6, under his Supposition III, in his Treatise on the Supremacy. St. Peter seems rather to have been, as St. Paul styles him, the "Apostle of the Circumcision," of the Jews "scattered abroad" throughout the world—a general, not a Diocesan, Apostle of the Jews—as St. Paul was a general, not a Diocesan, Apostle of the Gentiles. Whatsoever, therefore, the passage may mean, in reference to St. Peter, it proves nothing at all in reference to the Bishops of Rome.

We will present a few arguments against the Romish interpretation—rather a few brief points suggestive of argument.

In the first place, St. Matthew alone records this address of our Lord to St. Peter. The three other Evangelists omit it; while St. Mark and St. Luke actually relate the previous part of this conversation—our Lord's questions—Peter's confession—but omit the address which St. Matthew records, and on which Rome bases her monstrous claim. Now, if this passage

means all that Rome asserts—a sense which controls essentially not only all the institutions of the Church, but the entire truth of God, (for Rome claims to be the infallible Interpreter, not to say, Developer, of truth,) it is incredible that St. John should have omitted the entire conversation, and that St. Mark and St. Luke, (one of these, St. Mark, the particular companion and intimate friend of St. Peter, inasmuch that his Gospel was frequently called by the ancients St. Peter's Gospel,) when they relate a part of the conversation, should record the confession of Peter as the important part of it, and should omit the subsequent address upon which such essential influences for the Church and for the truth of God are claimed to depend.

Another argument against the Romish view of this passage, as giving to St. Peter and his successors a permanent supremacy, is in the fact, that our Lord did give to the other Apostles, on two separate occasions, (Matt. xviii, 18, John xx, 21-23,) in the very same words, and in words of corresponding import, (as we have already quoted them,) the very same powers here given to St. Peter, and distinctly putting all the Apostles on a perfect equality of office and of prerogative.

Again, if the literal sense of the passage be insisted on, as the Romanists do insist on it, it will then be confined to St. Peter personally, and cannot be extended to his successors, without violating the literal sense. For the words are addressed to St. Peter directly, "Thou art Peter . . . I say unto thee . . . I will give unto thee . . . whatsoever thou shalt bind," &c. If, therefore, we confine ourselves to the literal words of the passage, we certainly must cut off the future successors of St. Peter, if we cut off his fellow-Apostles. If the words are so literally exclusive, that they cannot include his fellow-Apostles who were present, and to whom the question, to which he replied, was put, they certainly cannot include the Bishops of future ages, even although they might be, as is not proved in the case of the Roman Bishops, his real successors.

Again, the subsequent history of the Apostles shows that no permanently exclusive privileges were here conferred upon St. Peter. And this argument is one which cannot be overthrown; for the Apostles must have known their Master's meaning, and their future action demonstrates their understanding of the sense of it. And when we come to trace their history, we do not find St. Peter exercising any prerogatives over the rest. At the Council of Jerusalem, (Acts xv,) he was evidently subordinate to James who presided in that Council. At Antioch, he was publicly rebuked by St. Paul before

all of the disciples, because of his dissembling with the Jews against the Gentiles. In his Epistles he assumes no pontifical rights, but on the other hand speaks of himself to the elders as being himself "also an elder." There is nothing in the whole history of the New Testament, which shows him to have had any prerogatives more or greater than were shared by all the Apostles. Never upon so slight a basis, has any pretension been erected, as this figment of the Papal Supremacy.

Another, and altogether convincing, argument against the Romish view of this passage, is, that the Primitive Fathers, who lived nearest the times of the Apostles, and must have understood their views, in no case sustain the Romish interpretation. On the contrary, they give quite a variety of interpretation, but in no case appropriate this promise to the supremacy of Rome—a fact not yet developed, and a claim not yet made, in their day. A few examples will suffice. Origen (A. D. 230) says that "every disciple of Christ is the Rock, in virtue of his agreement with Peter in that holy confession." Cyprian (A. D. 248) says that Peter "spoke for all, and answered in the name of the Church." Hilary (A. D. 354) asserts, "upon this Rock of the Confession is the building up of the Church." Jerome (A. D. 392) declares, that "Peter made his profession in the person of all the Apostles." Augustine (A. D. 398) affirms, that to Peter as "representing the whole Church, our Lord replied;" and again, "I know that I have often expounded that 'upon this Rock' is to be understood of Him whom Peter confessed;" and again, "upon this rock which thou hast confessed," and again, "upon this rock," that is, upon myself, said Christ, "will I build my Church." Chrysostom (A. D. 398) calls "the rock the faith of Peter's profession," and declares that "Christ said that he would build the Church on Peter's confession;" and in another place he writes, "upon this rock, he said not, upon Peter; for he did not build his Church upon the man, but upon his faith." Theodoret (A. D. 423) says, that "our Lord did fix the confession of Peter as a prop or foundation of the Church." These quotations might be multiplied. (See Barrow, Supp. I, Section 20.) They show that the Romish view of the passage was unknown in the early ages, and is the invention of a later and darker period; while the general view of these Primitive expositors seems to be, that the Rock referred to in the text as that upon which the Church is built, is the Confession of St. Peter, or rather He whom St. Peter confessed as "the Christ, the Son of the living God."

O the blessedness of the great truth in this confession ! May we stand upon this Rock—the Rock in this Confession of St. Peter—the Foundation, than which there is no other—the chief Corner-stone—Christ, the Divine Messiah. This stone is become the “Head of the Corner.” Before it superstition and usurpation, and sin will be rolled away. “Whosoever shall fall upon this stone shall be broken ; but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder.” This Stone shall “fill the earth,” and then, blessed will all those be who shall have confessed its power. Who will not be a Peter, like a rock, to stand firmly to the Confession of Christ ? Who will not be willing to discard the promptings of “flesh and blood,” and to listen to the “revelings of our Father which is in heaven,” and to confess the Supremacy of Jesus, in the fervent spirit of the bold Apostle, and say, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God !”

## ART. VII.—A MEMORIAL.

MESSRS. J. M. L. AND W. H. SCOVILL.

It has been often said, that at least in one respect, the Church of God and the natural world are alike. They each have far more numerous scenes of natural beauty on the one hand, or spiritual on the other, than the careless observer, or the thoughtless person, would imagine. We remember having this thought, for the natural world, brought very strikingly home to us some years since, when, as we were gazing on an extended prospect of unsurpassed and unimagined magnificence, we were told that, including ourselves, not more than thirty civilized persons had ever looked upon it. There it had been for centuries on centuries, resting in all its loneliness and grandeur; its lessons unread, its inspirations unfelt, save by a few wanderers whose footsteps had been led to it. And yet who could say that it had answered no purpose? Who could say it was nothing, that from its glorious mountain tops and its deep valleys, from its smiling lakes and its rushing torrents, from its spreading forests and its beetling crags, the "inarticulate voice of nature's praise," had gone up to God? The same principle holds all through, upon and beneath the earth and the sea. What beauties, what splendors, what prodigality and profusion of creative energy, live and pass away unseen by human eyes!

And even so it is in the Church. It is one of those similitudes of character, which go to show that nature and grace are from the same original. There, too, there are hidden glories and an unseen life. There, are heroic acts, and instances of self-denial, and penitential sorrows and devoted labors that are preserved in no human records. The nearest approach that was made to such a preservation was in the Diptychs, as they were called, of the Ancient Church; from which, in the Office for the Holy Communion, were read the names of those who had fallen asleep in Jesus, while at the close, the people gave thanks to God. Yet how imperfect, after all, was this memorial; and even it has passed away. Meantime all these unknown graces have not been unknown to God; they are written in a record that is better than any human one; and they shall all be known in that day, when, before they receive

the baptism of fire, "the earth and the sea shall give up their dead."

While, however, the analogy holds in the way just pointed out, there is one view, in which these unseen works of grace do live even upon earth. "No man liveth to himself alone, and no man dieth to himself alone." Each Christian soul is a centre of influences, the outgoings of which cannot be measured. In the Church of God, there is no individualization, no isolation. Each comes in some contact with another. Each has some influence upon another. Be the sphere great or small, this holds true. While, it is rarely they who have lived in the most exalted station, and wrought in the most extended spheres, that are chiefly to be considered here.

"What matter to ourselves the great?  
What the heart touches, *that* controls its fate!  
From the full galaxy we turn to one,  
Dim to all else, but to ourselves the sun;  
And still to each, in some obscurest life,  
Breathes all the bliss, or kindles all the strife.  
Wake up the countless dead! ask every ghost  
Whose influence tortured or consoled the most;  
How each pale spectre of the host would turn,  
From the fresh laurel, to the glorious urn,  
To point where rots beneath a nameless stone,  
Some heart, in which had ebb'd and flow'd its own."

Thus from all souls influences go forth, as light proceeds from distant stars; and like it they travel on and on, till in other years, perhaps, and in far off places, they reach the spiritual eye of some human soul, and lead that soul on to heaven, or lure it down to hell.

These considerations, while they invest all life with a power and dignity, the contemplation of which is awful and subduing, give an especial glory to a Christian's life, and impart to it a special interest. In more ways than at first we are apt to think, are "the righteous" to be "had in everlasting remembrance."

To preserve, as our pages can preserve, and to extend, as they can extend, the honored memory of two faithful followers of the Lord Jesus, and two loyal sons of the Church, is our object now. And if the regards of personal friendship are added as we write, to those of one form of pastoral relation, our words will not, we trust, be on that account, less faithful. While, if the memory of these two brothers after the flesh and in the Faith, belongs more especially to the ancient Diocese in which we write, their good example enters into, and forms a part of that great heritage of holiness, which we receive from the ages before us, and whose treasures increase as years roll by.



These brothers, JAMES MITCHELL LAMSON SCOVILL and WILLIAM HENRY SCOVILL, belonged to a family, which is identified with the history of the Church in Connecticut. Their grandfather, the Rev. JAMES SCOVILL, was one of the Missionaries of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; holding the cure of the Parish in Waterbury, and officiating in adjacent places, from 1759 till after the war of the Revolution, when he withdrew to the Province of New Brunswick, where he died in 1808. He was one of that little band of zealous native-born laborers, who among many toils and persecutions, sustained the fortunes of our infant Church. For, one thing ought not to be forgotten in reference to the work of the Venerable Society in Connecticut. While she furnished with a liberality which will demand our grateful acknowledgment as long as we remain a Diocese, the means by which the Missionaries were principally supported, yet the land itself with almost no exception, supplied the men. Few of our early Missionaries were foreigners. Mostly, they were the sons of those sires who had left the English Church, returning to the faith of their forefathers. It was of God's good mercy that it was so. For it gave the Church, so to speak, the character of indigenous upgrowth from the soil.

In other ways too, this family was connected with the fortunes of the Church. The step-mother of the Missionary was the widow of the first Churchman in the town which afterwards formed his cure; and both here and in New Brunswick, by intermarriage and descent, it has always numbered faithful and useful Clergymen among its members. Such a parentage is an honorable one.

The brothers were both born in Waterbury: the elder in 1789, and the younger in 1796. Their early advantages were those enjoyed by young men of their age at that time. All the educational training which they received over and above what was afforded by the common schools, was at the Episcopal Academy in Cheshire, then presided over by the Rev. Dr. BRONSON. Till about 1816, they both continued residents of their native village; and then, while the elder still remained there, the younger went forth as so many others have done; though unlike many of them, he returned again after the lapse of some years to join his brother in a career of honorable usefulness, in which they went on hand in hand, till death first called the younger home.

To Lamson Scovill, more than to any other man, the young city of Waterbury owes its prosperity. His strong and practical mind early saw its advantages in natural situation for all

those arts of manufacture, which form so important an element in the prosperity of New England. When he reached a conclusion, and it was never hastily, never on a partial survey only of its grounds, never without careful and solitary consideration, he always acted. And in most cases, to act was to succeed. So it was in this. Soon after he attained his majority, he turned his attention to this important matter, and laid the foundations of that long course of honorable prosperity with which it pleased God to bless him. In 1827, his younger brother was associated with him, and from that period their native town became the home of both. To use the well chosen words of another, "From that hour, though a passing cloud obscured their prospects by the burning of their factory, a tide of success poured in upon the brothers which is allotted to few—the honorable reward of a course of indomitable industry, perseverance and judicious management. Never were two men better calculated for each other—both were actuated by the highest impulses of integrity, and their qualifications, though different, were so happily blended, such was the confidence between them, that in all matters of business they were known only as one. Both at the time of their death were more or less identified with nearly every kindred establishment in the place—and one can hardly turn his eye without being reminded of their joint participation in the progress and adornment of their native city—the welfare of which formed one of the leading objects of their ambition."

It is always a satisfaction to turn to a career like this, of persevering, upright, patient industry. Especially at a time when so many are "making haste to be rich," and so "falling into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition," it is thoroughly a comfort to point to such examples of probity and strict integrity. It is specially well to tell those just entering into life, that the most honorable success is the truest also: that the blessing of God rests, as nowhere else, on such honest labors: and that the best measures of what even the world regards as prosperity, are given to those, who by such a course as that of which we are speaking, avoid that coveting after money, which causes so many to "err from the faith, and pierce themselves through with many sorrows."

What lay at the foundation of the whole for these brothers, was their religious principle; not a mere feeling now flashing up, and now dying out: not a sentiment too nice to be brought into contact with the toil and recoil, the wear and tear of everyday life, and so kept in a sort of luxurious seclusion for Sun-

days and sacred services ; not an inert mis-named faith, which could say to a suffering brother, Depart in peace, be warmed and filled ; not a sour, censorious severity, harsh with all others, and easy only with itself ; but a living principle, which went into the family, and the community, and the business, and which, if it found strength in God's House on His own day of rest, yet used the strength so gained through all the week besides.

And now, this brings us to that of which we are more particularly called to speak, their position and relations as members of that branch of the Church of God on earth, in which they were baptized and confirmed, and in whose full communion they died.

They were Churchmen, not more by hereditary descent and training, than from firm convictions, and an intelligent appreciation of the claims of our Communion. Their loyalty knew no wavering ; and what they held they held not as half afraid they were wrong, balancing here and hesitating there, but in the generous confidence of a well-grounded assurance of the truth. Nor was theirs, the mere comfortable satisfaction of holding the truth, a sort of aristocracy of being in the right. They recognized that great principle which so many seem to forget, that responsibilities wait on privileges : that gifts involve correspondent labors : and that from them to whom much is given, much will be required. And so they were ready not only to be almoners for God, and to give freely of what was entrusted to their stewardship, but they were ready also to work. In the Diocese, in the Parish, in the Sunday School, as Trustees of the College, in all lines where anything was to be done, they could be relied on.

Of the large alms which the yearly record of ST. JOHN'S PARISH shows, much was given by them. And the endowment of the Professorship of Natural Science in Trinity College, came from them, and one connected with them, not only in blood, but in even closer ties. One who was specially charged with the collection of that endowment, can never forget the way in which it was made. There had been some correspondence on the subject ; and at his own request for some definite proposition, it had been suggested to the elder brother, that he should consider whether he ought not to give the half. But it had been done without any urging or arguing, without anything in short beyond the suggestion of the consideration of duty. When the day for the decision came, he met the person with whom the communications alluded to were had, at his own door, and extending his hand, said : " I have

thought ever your suggestions; you are right: it is my duty to do it, and it shall be done." Not another word was spoken at the moment, but the pressure of the hand that was interchanged, and the moistened eyes with which the two looked at each other, said more than words. The same spirit was shown by the younger brother, even then stricken with the illness that brought him to the grave. And two other noble gifts—the allusion to which the living will pardon—completed on that day a work of love for Christ and His Church, which shall bear fruit long after he who came to ask help in his Master's cause, and they who so worthily gave it, are slumbering in the grave.

Is it necessary after this, to add that these brothers had that childlike, simple trust in the Redeemer and His suffering merits, which they who are trained in the grace of God, as the Church would train all her children, if men would let her, must always have? Alas! for an age which can make it needful. If it is, then here it is said distinctly. On this their lives were grounded, this made their deaths serene, in this they will rise in the resurrection of the just.

Lovely in their lives, they were not long divided in their deaths. The younger was called to his better home at a distance from his earthly one, though not entirely among strangers, on the 27th of March, 1854; and the elder entered into life on the 15th of May, 1857, amid the scenes and the friends of his early years.

The days of their burials were days to be noted. The silence of the Lord's Day rested on the city. Frequent emblems of mourning met the eye. The gloom was universal. Their fellow citizens and brother parishioners offered spontaneously all testimonies of respect. All was real. And he whose duty it was to commit all that was mortal of them to the trust of earth, felt as he spoke the solemn words, and heard the falling earth, that never should he utter those sublime consolations over better citizens, truer men, more faithful sons of CHRIST and His Holy Church.

There rest, till at "the judgment seat,  
Though changed and glorified each face,  
Not unremembered ye may meet,  
For endless ages to embrace."

## BOOK NOTICES.

**MISSIONARY TRAVELS and Researches in South Africa**; including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa, and a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope to Loanda on the West Coast; thence across the Continent, down the River Zambesi, to the Eastern Ocean. By DAVID LIVINGSTONE, LL. D., D. C. L. With two Maps by ARROWSMITH, a Portrait on Steel, and numerous Illustrations. One Volume. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1858. 8vo. pp. 732. New Haven: E. Downes.

What Dr. Barth and his companions have done for North Central Africa, Mr. Livingstone has done for South Central Africa. He is a Scotchman by birth, a member of the Scotch Kirk in religion, and was sent to Southern Africa in 1840, by the London Missionary Society, where he has been traveling for sixteen years. Starting from Algoa Bay on the Southern coast, he penetrated the interior and reached the Western coast at Loanda, latitude about ten degrees South. This is a Portuguese city of about twelve thousand inhabitants, now rapidly decaying, and has a Romish Cathedral, a Bishop, Jesuit institutions, &c., &c., and several Negro priests. From thence he pursued his way in a Southeastern direction, across the entire Continent, traversing the great water-shed of the country, where the Nile, the Congo, and the Zambesi have their origin. This region is not elevated more than four thousand feet above the level of the Sea, and the traditional opinion of vast mountains, covered with snow in those latitudes, is probably fabulous. He pursued his way down the Zambesi, a vast river, and reached the Indian Ocean at Quillmane, latitude  $17^{\circ}$  South. The commercial interests of that region are dormant under Portuguese misrule and imbecility. He took passage at Quillmane, for England, July 12th, 1856. The book has great attractions, not so much as a record of travel and adventure, though of these it is full, but as opening up to the eye of the civilized world a new country, and dissipating a multitude of wrong impressions. Hitherto Africa has been generally represented as a vast and barren region, unproductive and inhospitable. Whether Professor Guyot's theory of the origin of this Continent be correct or not, yet the physical conformation and features of Africa are found to be nearly similar to those of South America. Vast portions of it are very fertile, well watered, having a teeming population, and capable of being the abode of science, commerce, and Christianity. So promising is the region opened by Mr. Livingstone, that a deputation from the British Association for the Advancement of Science had an interview lately with the Earl of Clarendon, to represent to the Government the importance of sending a vessel to survey the entrance to the Zambesi river, in South Africa, and to ascend the same as far as practicable for navigation. The deputation consisted of the following gentlemen:—Rev. Dr. Lloyd, (President of the British Association,) Rev. Dr. Robinson, Sir R. Murchison, Mr. Macgregor Laird, and General Sabine. The Rev. Dr. Livingstone accompanied the deputation. Viscount Goderich, M. P., and Major-General Thomson, M. P., also presented memorials from the Leeds and Bradford Chambers of Commerce upon the subject of commercial intercourse with the parts of Africa recently explored by Dr. Livingstone. Efforts are also to be made to secure the coöperation of the Portuguese Government, whose influence preponderates at the mouth of the Zambesi River.

This large volume, to the naturalist, the philologist, the philanthropist, the political economist and the Christian, possesses much interest. The author greatly lacks scientific qualifications to describe what he saw; and his book is wanting in arrangement and generalization. He says, "he would rather cross the African Continent again, than attempt to write another book," and we readily believe it. But his present volume is full of valuable information notwithstanding. The Bechuana language is the court language of Southern Central Africa. Dr. Liv-

ingstone was able to travel comfortably with it fifteen thousand miles beyond the settlement from which he set out. It has nearly supplanted the languages of many tribes. The Bible has been translated into this important tongue by Mr. Moffat. The wretched and mischievous effect of sectism, in weakening the power of Christianity in South Africa, Mr. Livingstone confesses and mourns over. So it is and must be the world over.

**TRAVELS AND DISCOVERIES** in North and Central Africa. Being a Journal of an Expedition undertaken under the Auspices of H. B. M's. Government, in the Years 1849-1855. By HENRY BARTH, Ph. D., D. C. L., Fellow of the Royal Geographical and Asiatic Societies, &c., &c. Volume II. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 8vo. pp. 709. New Haven: E. Downes.

We gave in our last No. a sketch of the origin of the Expedition in which Dr. Barth was engaged, and of the general character of the results secured by it. We propose, when the work is completed, to give a summary of it. These discoveries of Dr. Barth and of Mr. Livingstone, bid fair to effect great changes in commerce, and, sooner or later, in the social condition of Africa. Dr. Barth is a thoroughly educated man, and his work is full of information and is written in good English, though its author is a German.

**POETS OF THE 19TH CENTURY.** Selected and edited by the Rev. ROBERT ARIS WILLMOTT. With English and American additions, arranged by EVERT A. DUYCKINCK, Editor of "Cyclopedia of American Literature." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 4to. pp. 616. New Haven: E. Downes.

This really elegant volume will be a most appropriate Gift-Book for the Season. The names of its Editors are a guarantee for the purity of sentiment which characterizes the selections. And this is everything in a work of this sort, read at moments when the heart craves sympathy and is most susceptible of impression. We allude to this, because one illustrated work of the season, issued, too, by a leading New York house, throws the embellishments of high Art around a character who ought to be consigned to oblivion or infamy. The selections in the present volume are also made with exquisite taste; several of them are among the finest gems of our language; and the Preface of the English Editor evinces that he knows how to appreciate them. They are taken from nearly one hundred and fifty of the Poets of the Nineteenth Century.

The volume is beautifully illustrated with one hundred and thirty-two engravings, from designs from the following eminent artists:—Birket Foster, W. Harvey, Harrison Weir, F. O. C. Darley, A. Hoppin, J. Gilbert, J. H. Hill, J. E. Millais, D. MacLise, W. Mulready, C. Stanfield, P. R. Pickersgill, J. Tenniel, T. Dalziel, J. W. Casilear, A. Hughes, E. Duncan, J. R. Clayton, J. Goodwin, J. D. Harding, G. Dodgson, F. M. Brown, W. L. Leitch, E. H. Corbould, D. Edwards.

It is published in elegant small 4to. form, printed on superfine tinted paper, richly bound in extra cloth beveled, gilt edges, price five dollars.

We will also do the publishers and our readers the kindness to add, that Messrs. Harper & Brothers will send this work by mail, securely enveloped in thick wrappers, postage paid, (for any distance in the United States under three thousand miles,) on receipt of five dollars.

We will also do ourselves the justice to say, that could we have had the American Editor's ear, we would have protested against some of the American Poets admitted, and some omitted.

**INSPIRATION: A DISCOURSE,** by EDWIN M. WHELOCK, at Dover, New Hampshire. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1857. 12mo. pp. 16.

In calling attention to this piece of blasphemous raving, and such it really is, our only object is to place before our readers one of the latest but strictly legitimate developments of a certain school of "thinkers" at the present day, who are more numerous, more influential, more zealous and active, and who occupy posi-

tions of more importance, than is generally supposed. However we may classify men, who have almost no common bond of union among themselves, whether as Bunsenists, or Arnoldites, or Broad Schoolmen, or Bushnellites, or Unitarians, and however they may differ among themselves, as on many other points, so also as to the fullness with which they carry out their principles to their legitimate results, they all agree in one thing; in denying the office of the Church as "The pillar and ground of the Truth," and in denying that view of Inspiration which has always been held and taught in the Church. To what extent these infidel notions of Inspiration are held in our own Branch of the Church, we do not know. That they are held and taught at all among us, we do not affirm. But there has never been a great movement in the English Church which has not been felt among ourselves; and the present powerful reaction from the extreme *ecclesiasticism*, and from the tendency to *Medievalism*, but lately so rife at Oxford; a reaction in which such men as Macnaught, and Jowett, and Williams, and Stanley, and Maurice, and Donaldson, and Kingsley, figure conspicuously, is likely enough to exert its influence this side the Atlantic. In that movement, Inspiration is one, and only one, of the leading points at issue; though some of the names we have mentioned are not so immediately connected with it.

This question of Inspiration is a vital question. To destroy the authority of Inspiration, and of the Bible as an inspired Book, to sink Inspiration into a mere "breathing in of higher influences," differing only in degree, and yet seen alike in kind, in inanimate and animate nature, in the poet, the orator, the sculptor, the warrior, and the prophet, of course destroys the foundation on which those Doctrines and Institutions rest, which challenge our acceptance on the ground of Inspiration or Revelation alone. The human mind, unaided, never could have discovered or originated them; and as they are remedies, adapted to our fallen nature, so human reason in its pride has always, under one plea or another, rebelled against them. But we have never, in our own country, from any man professing to be a Minister of Christ, seen a more unblushing utterance of this impious self-conceit, than in the "Discourse" before us. It rivals in horrid blasphemy, Paine's "Age of Reason," and the sneering attacks of Morgan, Tindal, and Bolingbroke; it is only a little more decent. Here are specimens:

"By an unhappy and superstitious confusion of thought, notions have been fastened in these times to the idea of inspiration, that are both unscriptural and untrue. It has been shut up within that small section of the world's literature called the Bible, denied to all books but the books of the Bible, and denied to all men but the writers of those books. And this *fencing in* has been pushed to its limits by the ascription of an *infallibility*, such as nowhere else is seen." \* \* \* "Here then we see the holy spirit inspiring not alone the old prophets, but the animals and plants, the stars above and the waters beneath, with all that is between, the dull dead matter of which the world is made, and even the abodes of hell. What terrible radicals were David, and Moses, and Isaiah! How totally 'unevangelical' are their ideas of inspiration! What shocking 'infidelity' is this, to consider the planets as inspired to travel their orbits round, and to look upon the animals and planets as filled with the holy spirit, when they were simply performing natural functions!" \* \* \* "Inspiration, then, we understand to be simply the breathing in of higher influences.

"Of course there are many degrees. There is the natural inspiration which flows from a lively appreciation of the beautiful and sublime in nature. The degree of its enjoyment depends upon fineness of organization. It comes to the instructed sight in every aspect of nature, 'whether it be the purity of virgin morning, or the sombre gray of a day of clouds, or the solemn pomp and majesty of night; whether it be the chaste lines of the crystal, the minute petals of the fringed daisy, or the waving outline of the distant hills.' Through these manifold forms and living garments of the All-Beautiful, comes the inspiration that we call natural; for earth and sky, and all between, are sources of constant inspiration to all well-constituted men.

"Above this is found the spiritual, or poetic, or human inspiration. Where the prompter is the spirit of man, inspiring us as an orator by his burning words, as a



musician by his sweet sounds, as an artist by the contrasts and harmonies of color; or when, in the stillness of meditation, thought bursts into flame, and soul-visions project themselves in exalted winged words; or the many-sided poet shapes into perfect utterance all the truths of human nature and the longings of the human soul; or when pondering the ideas of the infinite and eternal, the mind detects the immensity of the relations it bears to heaven and immortality, the frosts of indifference melt away, the old formulas of religious instruction break their husk, and give forth the seeds of wonder and of love.

"When the French at Sebastopol, recoiling twice before the grim face of the Malakoff, at last swarmed over ramparts, ditches, batteries and men, chanting the forbidden Marseillaise, it was the inspiration of that grand war-song that bore them on to victory." \* \* \* \*

"In the Psalms and prophecies, in Job, and in Revelations, we have the higher or spiritual, or poetic inspiration.

"While only in the gospel of the Crucified One, only in the words and life of the Son of God, our Master and Lord, do we find the inspiration that is divine, undimmed by the touch of error." \* \* \* \*

"This darkened Jewish fire of inspiration which Calvin and his spiritual progeny absorbed in preference to the undimmed light of the embodied 'Word,' has generated, as a natural result, the smoke of falsities and multiform heresies of dogma; engendering bigotry and 'evangelical' conceit, and enwrapping every saving truth of Christ in moral midnight.

"See what a monstrous chain of doctrinal errors come trooping in. *A Trinity of gods, made up of a Father, a Son, and a bird. A vicarious atonement, of which the essential virtue lies in the literal blood of Christ. An instantaneous regeneration, the fruit of an eternal sovereign election. A justification grounded upon faith alone, to the exclusion of love. An imputed, not an imparted righteousness. The resurrection of the body. A last judgment at the end of the world. A personal second coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven. And an actual conflagration of the globe by fire. All these are the outbirth of the dead, literal, sacrificial inspiration, of Jewish fallible men.*" (The italics are ours.)

"If, then, this body of doctrine, so replete with festering error, has its foundation laid in wrong views of Scripture authority, how pressing the necessity of a true philosophy of inspiration, one which shall discriminate between the DIVINE WORD, and the human and earthly matter, in which it lies embedded, like dust of gold in California placer. \* \* \* \*

"Many a pious female reads with edifying delight the song of Solomon, who would reject with horror the songs of Byron, or Moore, though they are written from the same kind of voluptuous, poetic inspiration.

"See, too, how with eyes askance, the votaries of book infallibility hate science. Every new stake that science plants, orthodoxy hastens to pluck up, though more often it merely impales itself. It sees the positive conflict between the letter of Scripture and the irresistible conclusions of science. It sees that the stubborn facts cannot be hid, and so it invents fantastic solutions of knotty texts, murdering syntax and etymology outright. 'It hears that Smith, or Owen, or Lyell, are reading God's handwriting in the rocks, affirming an age for our earth transcending by millions of years the petty chronology of the Mosaic period. Or it learns that Agassiz and Morton, scanning the field of anthropology, and exploring the archives of history, have gathered a mountain mass of testimony, going to prove a diversity of human races, instead of referring all mankind to a single pair. And its panic at these results reminds us of the poet's picture of old Priam's fright, when his curtains are drawn at dead of night, and word conveyed that half his Troy was burned.

"Only through belief in the American prophet Garrison, can come the true belief in the Hebrew prophet Moses. Such is the position of the popular religion in America to-day."

We think we have quoted enough. We avow our firm belief that on the ground of this question of Inspiration, and of the Church as the Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ, is to be fought the great battle of Infidelity at the present day; and

fought, too, within the ranks of professed disciples of Christ. How far Churchmen can fraternize with bodies which hold or tolerate such heresies, is another question, and an important one, which we do not here touch.

SERMONS OF THE REV. C. H. SPURGEON, of London. Second Series. New York : Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1857. 12mo. pp. 441. New Haven : F. T. Jarman.

The first thing that strikes us on opening this volume, is, that these Sermons are not all of them new to us. One of them, Sermon III, from the text, Ps. cxxvii, 2, "For so he giveth his beloved sleep," we heard several months since from a popular preacher of our Church; and we gather from the papers of the day that several of the Sermons, by which the same Clergyman has gained a high and paying reputation as a preacher, were taken from the same or a similar source. If this is not "obtaining goods under false pretences," we know not what is. The same Clergyman has been somewhat conspicuous in publicly rebuking some of his clerical brethren for not marching under a certain party flag, and submitting to a certain party drill. However, Churchmen are learning more and more that true piety never boasts of itself, nor blows its own trumpet; and that there are some other things besides Charity which (for a little while at least) can be made to cover a multitude of sins.

We have studied these Sermons of Spurgeon, to see if we can find in them the secret of his popularity as a preacher; and we have come to the conclusion, that his Sermons have been thoroughly pruned before committing them to the press; and that much of his popularity must depend upon mere manner. If it is universally true that *poeta nascitur*, it is not universally and equally true that *orator fit*. There is a certain charm or fascination in the true orator, which can never be acquired; and though this higher region of eloquence is not requisite to ministerial usefulness, for multitudes of the most successful ministers have lacked it, still it, and it alone, can account for the prodigious effects produced by the delivery of certain discourses by certain men. We see enough in these Sermons of Mr. Spurgeon to attract present attention. There is a painful familiarity in speaking of the awful mysteries of the eternal world, which reminds us of Finney, and Burchard, and Boyle, of our own country; and there is a studied violation of the conventional proprieties of social life in his dealing with men and with human opinions, which will of course, for the moment, please the masses, as it is in a vein which they can appreciate. All this, is, of course, of the *ad captandum* style, and will soon wear out. Thus, in a printed report of his Sermon on Sunday Morning, July 5th, Mr. Spurgeon is reported to have said, "And I just announce, that the first chance I get to preach in a parish Church, I will do it, and risk the consequences. They are our structures; they belong to all England; we can give them to whom we please; and if, to-morrow, the will of the sovereign people should transfer those edifices to another denomination, there is nothing in the world that can prevent."

The essential vulgarity of the man, is seen in the following report of another of his Sermons: "The speaker proposed to treat of the second part of the text, 'My expectation is from him.' Looking significantly for a moment, and pointing with his finger as if to some one on whom his eye had fixed, he said, 'You have a grandfather, or an old grandmother, or a great aunt. She has some thousands of pounds. Of course, you do not care for *them*, but your affection for her is quite overwhelming. You torment her with your anxieties about her. Your frequent inquiries after her health and the tenderness of your embraces are extremely teasing. You are waiting upon her continually. (Great laughter.) Why is this? Your expectation is from her. By-and-by you will hear that that health you have so tenderly inquired after is broken down, and then—that she is dead. You will mourn and grieve over her, and dress yourself in the deepest black, but oh! there will be a magnificent consolation in those thousands of pounds that have come at last!" (Laughter.)

Speaking of the duty of prayer in times of doubt, he said, "the proper way is to go to God straight at once, and before going to anybody else, and before you

have made up your mind. People often come to me for advice—mostly young people—who ask me if I advise them to get married—(more laughter)—whereas everybody knows that that is a subject on which people do not like advice, and on which they make up their minds on their own account."

On the whole, we conclude there is a vast deal of the merest "clap-trap" in this Spurgeon; and yet several of his printed Sermons contain much important truth and well put.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY, devoted to Literature, Art and Politics. November, 1857. Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company.

The appearance of a new Monthly from Boston, with so much of pretension and such an imposing list of contributors, is one of the literary events of the season. There is available ability enough in the country to make this Monthly the Blackwood of American literature. But will it be such? That is the question. One drawback to its success will be the intense provincialism of everything really genuine that comes from Boston. One of our Contributors, years ago, hit this Boston weakness in his description of the "Mutual Admiration Society;" and he hit it so well that the *sobriquet* has stuck to the Boston clique ever since. By the by, the late R. W. Griswold attributed the authorship of that Article to Bishop Doane of New Jersey; though it has not in it the slightest mark of his peculiar style. But this feature alone would not kill the new work. People would laugh at the "Mutual Admirationists," and would read their Monthly notwithstanding. The great difficulty then, in the way of making this work what it ought to be, will be, we fear, the want of a true and broad Catholicity. For these men, if they are to discuss high questions of Christian Art, and Christian Literature, and Christian Politics, cannot go back much beyond themselves without discovering, what some of them seem never to have discovered, that there were some such things as these even before Boston was ever heard of; and that there is a certain breadth and depth of tone belonging to them to which alone the heart of Christendom will truly respond. Will the new Monthly recognize this key note? We shall see.

And then, again, if Christianity and Politics are to be served up as a regular dish, and these writers are to write in earnest, and not as mere abstractionists, we can easily enough give a sort of Yankee guess what the Bill of Fare will be, with such names as Emerson, and Whittier, and Quincy, and Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Parke Godwin, to cater for the public. If, therefore, the new Magazine is to be intensely sectional, intensely "humanitarian," and intensely radical and revolutionary, its history can be written at the start. It will blaze away like a sky-rocket for a while, to the astonishment and admiration of its friends, and die out at last like a sky-rocket, with an explosion, or for lack of material to keep up the combustion.

The best, though not the ablest Article in the present No., is "Pendlam," a Modern Reformer, said to be by the author of "Neighbor Jackwood." Wendell Holmes' wit scintillates a little in the "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," but he writes better poetry than prose. Emerson oraculates his *quantum* of transcendental moonshine. He has four Sonnets, which may be read in any direction, upward or downward, forward or backward, horizontally, perpendicularly or diagonally almost equally well. The ablest Articles do not bear the Magazine stamp; and there are two or three not above the average mark of newspaper stories. On the whole, the Number has talent enough to promise well in this respect. But whether, with such a class of contributors, the work will possess unity of character, and still subserve the great cause of Christian Art and Christian Literature in our Republic, remains to be proved.

The December No. has since appeared. The mask is thrown off, and the stand taken. Henceforth there is no doubt where the "Atlantic Monthly" is to be found. There are two Articles in this No., one on "Thomas Carlyle," and one entitled "Where will it End?" which are thoroughly charged with the virus of the William Lloyd Garrison School; a School boasting of its liberality, yet made up of the most bitterly intolerant men in the country; men who seem to strive to outdo

each other, in uttering blasphemies against God and Religion, and in saying wicked things against the greatest and best men of our Republic. Washington, especially, is a special object of their malignant hate. We presume there is in the country enough of religious indifferentism, and provincial toadyism, and latent and open infidelity, as when combined, to give to this Monthly quite an enthusiastic reception.

**LADY HUNTINGDON PORTRAYED**; including brief sketches of some of her friends and co-laborers. By the author of "The Missionary Teacher," &c. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1857. 12mo. pp. 319.

This sketch of the celebrated Lady Huntingdon, prepared by an admirer, and evidently a Wesleyan Methodist, presents an instructive commentary upon the religious history of England during the latter half of the last century. It is a well written sketch of her life, her conversion and religious zeal, her abounding liberality, her sympathy with the Wesleys, and Whitfield, and Fletcher; nor does it conceal the fact of her formal separation from the Established Church and the organization of the "Lady Huntingdon Connection," in 1783, and the consequent withdrawal from her Chapels of such men as Romaine, and Venn, and Townsend. In the breach which occurred between the Wesleys and Whitfield, in 1770, she adopted the strong Calvinistic doctrines of the latter, and wrote to Mr. Wesley that as long as he held certain sentiments, her pulpits were shut against him, and so they remained until her death. With all her faults of character, we doubt not that much of her eccentricity, and of the irregularity for which she is to be held responsible, grew up, in the outset, from the deep yearnings of her heart for a truer and deeper spiritual life than she found in the superficial morality and godless formalism which so much prevailed in the Church. It is easy enough to sneer at the Lady Huntingdon; it is better to learn wisdom from a development which has now become a matter of history, and which has resulted in the formation of perhaps the largest religious body of our country. To us, as Churchmen, the moral of her history is, that Apostolic life must be infused into our Apostolic Ministry, and Creeds, and Worship.

**THE PSALMS CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED**, with Historical Introductions, and a General Introduction to the whole Book. By F. G. HIBBARD, Author of History and Geography of Palestine, etc. In two Parts. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1857. 8vo. pp. 589.

There is not, we think, any one surer test of a truly devout mind, and of a state of preparedness for the worship and blessedness of the heavenly world, than a growing delight in the Psalms of David. Such, too, has been the judgment of the holiest saints on earth. The learned Salmasius, on his death-bed, said, "I have lost a world of time; if I had one year more, I would spend it in reading DAVID'S PSALMS and PAUL'S EPISTLES." The author of this volume has been industrious in gathering and compiling information as to the chronological order of the Psalms, their authorship, and the circumstances under which they were written. In all this, he adopts the most approved opinions; and in this respect especially his work is valuable. In his appreciation of the deep spirituality of the Psalms, and in the clearness with which he sees, everywhere, in them, the Person and Offices of JESUS CHRIST, and the glories and felicities of a brighter and better world, the author is thoroughly orthodox; and is in grateful contrast with the cold neologism of such men as Whateley and the German School. As a practical Commentary, the work makes no pretensions; and is not to be compared in this respect with Bishop Horne, whose Commentary we wish was more thoroughly studied in the Church. But as a most important adjunct to the intelligent study of the Psalms, we know not where so much really valuable matter can be found in so small a compass.

**THE ROMANY RYE. A Sequel to "Lavengro."** By GEORGE BORROW, Author of "The Bible in Spain," "The Gypsies of Spain," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 8vo. pp. 141. New Haven: E. Downes.

It is difficult to tell precisely all the objects which the author hoped to accom-

plish by "Romany Rye." Judging from his Appendix, however, which is a long and somewhat ill-tempered defense of "Lavengro," we take the author to be a sort of grumbler in general, a kind of social scavenger, always a very disagreeable sort of body, and yet one who after all does a great deal of good. "Lavengro," it seems, disappointed the author. We conclude it did not sell. But so far from attacking critics, or appealing to public sympathy, as an abused man, and the victim of abuse from *castes* of all sorts whose intolerance, and shallowness, and vices, he has exposed, we conclude that the secret of his failure is of another kind. The truth is, he has been thumbing one string too long. The public have got tired of this perpetual slang about gypsies, and tinkers, and thimble-riggers, and blacklegs, and horse-jockies, even if it is cleverly told, and if its sly hits or open thrusts at Romanism and Germanism, and a rotten aristocracy, and snobism, and humbuggery in general, are well put, and well deserved. Besides, when Mr. Borrow takes to finding fault with the institutions of his country themselves, as well as their abuses, and holds up to contempt the noblest names in her history, he will be very apt to learn something about Mr. George Borrow which he never knew before. A good many men have learned a similar lesson in a similar way.

THE CITY OF SIN AND ITS CAPTURE BY IMMANUEL'S ARMY. An Allegory. By Rev. E. F. REMINGTON, A. M., of the Protestant Episcopal Church. With an Introduction by Rev. GEORGE B. CHEEVER, D. D. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1857. 12mo. pp. 336.

With Mr. Remington, as an author, we do not remember to have met before; but his Allegory, in all respects, in conception, language, taste, style, sentiment, sensibility, refinement, and doctrine, is quite in the vein of the Cheever School. The Allegory begins thus: "The City of Sin is built in the form of a circle. The streets, like so many radii, run from the centre to the circumference. Every street, lane, and dark alley, is paved with human skulls. The walls, of great thickness and exceeding height, are built of human bones, cemented with blood and tears." As a work of art, the book reminds us of the coarse, rough daubs, the pictures of demons, ghosts and hobgoblins which hang upon the walls of third and fourth-rate Romish Churches to frighten silly people, and to disgust sensible ones. We are happy to believe that there is among Churchmen no appetite to be fed with such intellectual and æsthetical *pabulum*.

AN ADDRESS TO THE PASTORS AND PEOPLE OF THESE UNITED STATES, on the Chaplaincy of the General Government, viewed in its connection with extending the Redeemer's Name in the world. By LORENZO D. JOHNSON, Author of "Government Chaplains," &c. Washington, D. C. 1857. 8vo. pp. 31.

The object of Dr. Johnson in this pamphlet, is to call attention to the general subject of the Chaplaincy of our General Government. He treats upon the authority under which Chaplains have been appointed; the objections urged from time to time against their employment; the totally inadequate number to meet the wants of our Army and Navy; and especially the disgraceful practice of late witnessed, of men professing themselves Ministers of Christ, and yet hanging about Washington, electioneering for the appointment of Chaplain of Congress, log-rolling, button-pulling, fawning, and playing the sycophant, to the deep dishonor of themselves, and of the religion which they profess. The author urges upon "pastors and people to memorialize Congress, praying it to abandon the system which invites electioneering for a chaplainship, by a return to the usage of the Fathers, who employed those clergy only, who were located in the city or district in which Congress held its sessions; also praying for the organization of a Chaplain Board, for the purpose of elevating the standard of Chaplain qualifications, by opening the door only to devout and consecrated men; also for creating a new security that the supply of Chaplains in the Army and Navy shall hereafter come nearer to the demand."

Dr. Johnson gives some facts not generally known. He states, that since the year 1813, "There have served in the United States Army, for a longer or shorter

period, at posts and hospitals, eighty Chaplains. Of these, as nearly as we have been able to ascertain, forty-three have been Episcopalians; ten Presbyterians; five Baptists; three Methodists; three Roman Catholics; one Universalist; one of the Dutch Reformed Church; one Lutheran, and twelve whose church relations are not known."

"The first Chaplain appointed to the United States Navy, received his commission from President John Adams, and was ordered on board the first frigate ready for a cruise. From that time to the present, there have been appointed seventy-four Naval Chaplains; twenty-two of whom are Episcopalians; ten Presbyterians; nine Methodists; five Baptists; four Congregationalists; one Universalist; one Unitarian, and twenty-three whose church relations are not now known."

In respect to the great deficiency of Chaplains, it appears that in the Army, the United States and Territories are set off into six great military departments, embracing about ninety forts, barracks, and stations, besides twenty-six arsenals; occupied by officers and men, in all varying from twelve to eighteen thousand. And yet, to meet these wants, there are but *twenty-two* Chaplains employed.

As to the Navy, our present authorized naval force amounts to nearly nine thousand men, composing about ninety distinct crews, or congregations,—there being about eighty-six vessels of war, with crews numbering from fifty, to five, six, and seven hundred men. There are, in our Navy, but *twenty-four* Chaplains.

Dr. Johnson's pamphlet is an important one. We hope our Houses of Congress will frown upon any "Minister" who allows himself, in the language of another, to be "trotted out" as a candidate. A member of Congress openly declared,

"At the opening of every session of Congress ministers come here, either in person or through their agents, and log-roll to obtain the position of Chaplain. I think it high time this system should be abolished."

Said another:

"For myself I confess I have witnessed electioneering efforts connected with the Chaplaincy of this House, which are not compatible with the ministerial character."

It is high time that a public sentiment was aroused upon this whole subject, both to meet positive wants and to correct disgraceful evils.

**SCPTICISM A FOLLY:** Five Letters occasioned by a Geological Article in the Westminster Review for July, 1857. By ADAM TOWNLEY, D. D., Incumbent of Paris, C. W. Toronto: 1857. 16mo. pp. 27.

We fully agree with the Reverend author as to the folly of modern scepticism; and the shallowness of most of the arguments with which Christianity is assailed in these days by some of the votaries of Physical Science. At the same time, there are no stronger believers in the Mosaic account of the Creation, than some of our modern Geologists; indeed, they affirm that that account is illustrated and confirmed by the progressive and more perfect developments of life as exhibited in geological researches; and they have quite as little sympathy with the infidelity of Agassiz, and Gliddon, and Nott, and the Westminster Review school, as the author can possibly have. We have no fears for the Bible. Its Chronology, its asserted Unity of the Human Race, and its historical fidelity, have outlived the sneers of the French infidels of the last century, and are even borne witness to by the researches of modern Science. The God of Nature is the God of Revelation; and He has not affirmed in one, what He has denied in the other; we only need to read both aright.

**THE TRUE WOMAN:** Or Life and Happiness at Home and Abroad. By JESSE T. PECK, D. D., Author of "The Central Idea of Christianity." New York: Carlton & Porter. 1857. 12mo. pp. 400.

The author of this book, Dr. Peck, is a Wesleyan Methodist; his work is strictly didactic, and is illustrated, he says, here and there by examples of the "true woman" in real life. But his examples are all taken from the Methodist denomination, with its multiform machinery, its Camp-Meetings, and Love Feasts, &c.,

&c., where woman, forgetting the injunction of the Apostle, and the modesty and instinctive delicacy of her sex, becomes the public exhorter and leader of devotion. The "true woman" must always revolt at such a public exhibition of herself; and as society advances in true refinement and social culture, the Methodists will abandon this as they are abandoning other of their peculiarities. Indeed, the whole genius and spirit of Methodism is of necessity undergoing a transformation. Its interior life, its practical workings, its tone and temper towards the Church, its discipline, its hierarchical despotism, its doctrinal steadfastness—all these are changing, and in the older parts of our country, are changing rapidly. Dr. Peck's book contains a great many good things, and some which are important outside the circle for which they were written.

THE ITINERANT SIDE; or Pictures of Life in the Itinerancy. Third thousand. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1857. 12mo. pp. 268.

With all the other "sides" of the Ministry, there is, it seems, an itinerant side. Admirably suited as the itinerancy is for pioneer work, it is ill adapted to a well-organized state of society, where ministerial efficiency depends upon the minister himself becoming inwrought into the social structure, and upon the place he thus gains in the knowledge, affections and confidence of his people. This book is very well written, and, we doubt not, gives one of the features of Methodism truthfully. We see here one of the weakest points of the system, and where, sooner or later, it will yield to the force of circumstances.

ANNALS OF CHRISTIAN MARTYRDOM. By the Author of "The Lives of the Popes." Ancient Martyrs. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1857. 12mo. pp. 407.

A mere compend, evidently made by a one-sided man, well-enough in its way, but not possessing much value.

GUY LIVINGSTONE; or, "Thorough." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 12mo. pp. 339. New Haven: E. Downes.

This is an English reprint—a highly-wrought tale of merely worldly passion, effectively told. Its spirit and tone are thoroughly immoral.

THE OBJECT OF LIFE. A Narrative illustrating the Insufficiency of the World and the Sufficiency of Christ. Four Illustrations. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1857. 12mo. pp. 357.

This story is one of the publications of the London Religious Tract Society, from which the volume before us is a reprint, "with slight alterations." The story is well written and forcibly illustrates one great fact. But like a great many books, and a great many preachers, it does not go, nor look beyond that fact; mere conversion is everything; while life, culture, growth, means, Sacraments, are nothing. It is a good book for a certain purpose, and as far as it goes.

THE HASHEESH EATER; being passages from the Life of a Pythagorean. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 12mo. pp. 371. New Haven: E. Downes.

Whether we have fact or fiction in these pretended confessions of a "hash-eesh eater," we know not; yet none but a perverted and depraved heart can feast upon such insane ravings, even though the lofty genius of a Coleridge or a DeQuincey may have reveled in this sublimated sensualism, and mistaken it for the highest form of pure idealism. A great deal of our modern Coleridgeism is nothing more nor less than the dreamy reveries of the opium eater and the tobacco smoker, in set formulae.

LIFE STUDIES; OR, HOW TO LIVE. Illustrated in the Biographies of BUNYAN, TERSTERGEN, MONTGOMERY, PERTHER, and Mrs. WINSLOW. By the Rev. JOHN BAILLIE. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 12mo. pp. 365. New Haven: E. Downes.

The author of this volume says, "CHRIST CRUCIFIED is not a mere fund in re-



serve—a kind of 'extreme unction'—to teach men how to die; it is the lever which is to move the life." This is a great thought and the volume was written to illustrate it. Yet it is only one of a circle of truths, all in harmony with each other.

**A GUIDE TO THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.** In a series of Lectures on the Baptismal Service; delivered in Trinity Church, New Haven, preparatory to Confirmation. By the Rector. New Haven. 1857. G. B. Bassett & Co. 12mo. pp. 120.

The Venerable Rector of Trinity Church is one of the few connecting links left which unite us to the Fathers of the American Church. His view of the nature, import, and necessity of the Sacraments, is that held by the old sound divines of the Church in England and in this country; the language of our Sacramental Formularies is guarded against perversion and misconstruction; while the spiritual and subjective qualifications required for the due reception of the Sacraments are enforced clearly and earnestly. Of course, the teaching of these lectures as to the character of man by nature, is radically opposed to the popular sentiment and popular theology of the day; which does away, not only with Sacraments, but with the Christology of the Old Testament, with the Atonement, with the Trinity, and with every thing that is supernatural in Christianity and its Institutions. Indeed, in all these respects, Dr. Crowell is a very old-fashioned man. And yet, a perfect simplicity of faith in what Christ has revealed, and an utter distrust in man's inventions, is the lesson which the Church will sooner or later learn.

**ANNEKE JANS AND TRINITY CHURCH.** The Title, Parish Rights and Property of Trinity Church, New York, from the Appendix to Bishop DeLancey's Twentieth Conventional Address, delivered in Oswego, Aug. 19th, 1857. Utica: 1857. 8vo. pp. 23.

Bishop DeLancey here presents, in a condensed form, the grounds on which the Corporation of Trinity Church has been assailed, and gives a complete digest of the case, showing, we think, beyond a doubt, the validity of the title of Trinity Church to the property which she holds, and her perfect right to its management, and to the distribution of its avails.

In 1836, the Commissioners of the Land Office, consisting of Messrs. Samuel Beardsley, John A. Dix, A. C. Flagg, A. Keyser and William Campbell, put their names to the following OPINION, and establish the following facts:

#### OPINION.

1. That the Rector, Church Wardens and Vestrymen of Trinity Church, in the city of New York, are a valid corporation, with full power to hold the real estate which has been referred to.
2. That it has a valid, subsisting, and absolute title to the lands referred to.
3. That it is entitled to the rents and profits of said lands, without any regard to the amount of income which they may yield.

#### FACTS.

They establish the following facts:

1. That in 1705, Lord Cornbury, Governor of the Province of New York, in the name, and as the act and deed of Queen Anne, made a lease, by which the lands called the Queen's Farm and the Queen's Garden, were granted and confirmed to the corporation of Trinity Church, and their successors forever, to be holden in free and common socage, paying the yearly rent of three shillings.
2. That the power of the Provincial Governor to make leases of the Crown Lands, was unlimited in 1705, when the lease in question was made.
3. That the lease was valid and effectual in its inception, and was so regarded during the continuance of the Provincial Government.
4. That the lease of 1705, had been regarded as a subsisting and valid grant, not only by the Provincial Government, to as late a period as 1750, when quit rent

was paid upon it, but by the Government of this State in 1786, when the quit rent reserved was finally commuted and satisfied.

5. That the corporation of Trinity Church has held these lands, claiming an absolute and indefeasible title to them from the time of the commutation and payment of said quit rent in 1786, (then, in 1836, *fifty* years, and now, in 1857, *seventy-one* years.)

6. That if the people of the State had then, in 1786, a right to these lands, that right has been lost by lapse of time, the right of suing for the recovery of lands being limited to *forty* years in this State, and in England and Provinces to *sixty* years.

7. And that the Legislature of the State have repeatedly recognized the corporation of Trinity Church, as a legal, valid, and subsisting corporation.

JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE. London. 1857.

In the July No. of this Periodical, we find a reprint of an Article from the April No. of the *Church Review*—"Does the Bible need retranslating?" together with some editorial comments designed for our own special benefit. The *Journal* says the "Americans get all at sea with their pointing," &c. We are disposed to leave the particular instance cited to the author of the Article, who, by the way, is a titled graduate of a distinguished British University. But our British consins are so apt to indulge in such captious remarks, and seem to be so fond of reading us homilies on a good many subjects, that we are disposed to let them have a proof of their own accuracy in matters quite as important as "pointing." The following are a few specimens taken from what professes to be a standard work; viz, the *Encyclopædia of Geography*, a ponderous 8vo. of 1600 pages, edited by Hugh Murray, F. R. S. E., assisted by Professors Wallace and Jameson, of the University of Edinburgh, and Professor Hooker, of the University of Glasgow, and Mr. Swainson, F. R. S. and F. L. S., and published in Edinburgh:

"The United States Territory is separated from Canada by the St. Lawrence River." (p. 1327.)

"New England, now the most *flourishing* of the States," &c. (p. 1337.)

"The President continues in office four years, and may be reelected. *But this has not taken place with any except Washington.*" (p. 1338.)

"The general aspect of the Eastern States is that of an *unbounded forest.*" (p. 1340.)

"The rivers running across the Eastern States have been united at different points, and it is expected that a continued interior line from North to South will be ultimately formed." (The writer is speaking of canals. p. 1342.)

"Dr. Franklin, once on a journey, judged it wise to bear upon his person a label, expressing his name, his business, whence he came, and whither he was going." (p. 1343.)

"There are twenty-five Colleges and seventy-four Academies under the patronage of the *General Legislature*, and a National University has been planned." (p. 1344.)

"Boston, the capital of Massachusetts, of the *State of New England*, and, until lately, of the *whole Union*, is built on a Peninsula." "East Boston, *where all the business is carried on*, consists of a number of narrow streets and alleys," &c. (p. 1346.)

"New Hampshire, *stretching south from Massachusetts*, occupies a very great part of the surface of New England," and in this State "nothing is more common than to see a grandmother at forty, and the *mother and daughter are often suckling children at the same time*"!!! (p. 1347.)

The *Moniteur*, the official journal of the French Government, in its issue of Nov. 26, 1857, commences an Article on our elections thus: "The States of New York, Baltimore, New Orleans, have gone," &c.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE CHURCH BOOK SOCIETY.

1. LIFE OF THE REV. HENRY MARTYN, B. D., &c. By the Rev. D. P. SANFORD, Brooklyn, N. Y. 18mo. pp. 223.

Mr. Sanford has done his work exceedingly well, in presenting so interesting and complete a sketch of one of the brightest intellects and most saintly men who have ever adorned the ranks of the Church's missionaries.

2. THE LITTLE HOUSEKEEPER; or the Children at Forest Furnace. By the Author of "Timid Lucy." 12mo. pp. 141.

The sweet influence of genuine piety in the humblest walks of life, in subduing the passions, curbing the temper, and smoothing the manners, is pleasantly illustrated in this story.

3. SUNDAY AT OATLANDS; or Quiet Bible Talks. By ALICE B. HAVEN, (Cousin Alice.) 18mo. pp. 146.

Those interesting portions of Old Testament History, which always chain the attention of children, are made to distill the choicest lessons of Christian wisdom by this agreeable writer.

4. THE SCHOOLMATES: A Story of recent Experience. 18mo. pp. 106.

A very well-written sketch of the religious character of three Schoolmates. It will, we doubt not, impress the duties of the Christian life and their necessity on the heart of many a careless school-girl. The writer knows how to probe the conscience, and to expose the flimsy excuses of the neglectors of religion. Her earnest work will do great good, for it treats the soul and its destiny as realities not to be trifled with.

5. NOT A MINUTE TO SPARE. 18mo. pp. 115.

This little volume is filled with incidents, showing how much is risked and lost by "not having a minute to spare;" and contains choice directions for the proper husbanding of time.

These five volumes are neatly published, are handsomely illustrated, are well written, and will form valuable additions to our Sunday School and juvenile libraries.

BISHOP DOANE'S EIGHTH BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS, at the Commencement of Burlington College, in St. Mary's Church, on the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels, 1857.

This Address is mainly a delineation of the life and character of WARREN LIVINGSTON, a graduate of Burlington; and who afterwards entered Oxford University, where he won high honors. He was both "a Christian scholar and a Christian gentleman;" and, so, an illustration of the theme of the Bishop's Baccalaureate Address. His death was the first which has occurred among the Alumni of the College.

## CATALOGUE OF YALE COLLEGE, 1857-58.

This venerable College numbers *five hundred and sixty-five* Students in all its departments; and has *sixty-five thousand* volumes in its Libraries; besides the valuable Library of the American Oriental Society, now kept in the Library building.

## CALENDAR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD. 1857-58.

The Classes in this College number, Seniors 13; Juniors 11; Sophomores 11; Freshmen 22; in all, fifty-seven Students.

## THE POCKET-DIARY FOR 1858. New York: Carlton &amp; Porter. 18mo. pp. 224.

As a Pocket-Diary for mere business, it is as compact and as conveniently arranged as it well can be.

HARPER'S STORY BOOKS. No. 35. VIOLA AND HER LITTLE BROTHER ARNO. No. 36. LITTLE PAUL; or, how to be patient in sickness and pain.

HARPER'S NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE No. XCI. December, 1857.

This is the First No. of a new Volume of a work which has attained the enormous circulation of over *one hundred and seventy thousand* copies, and which distances in popularity all our American Monthlies. With such original contributors as Thackeray and Charles Reade, and many of our most popular American writers, it may defy competition in catering for the amusement of the public.

THE SALARIES OF THE CLERGY: With an Address from the Rt. Rev. Bishop GREEN of Mississippi. Published by the Society for Diffusing Christian Knowledge in the Diocese of Mississippi. Vicksburg. 1857. 8vo. pp. 24.

This strong and timely remonstrance against the pitiful salaries doled out to the Clergy in a very large proportion of our parishes, is a reprint of an Article in the last July No. of the Church Review. Its author is the Rev. JNO. TRAVERS LEWIS, LL. D., of Canada West. The salaries of Pilots on our Western Rivers range from \$150 to \$300 per month, or from \$1,800 to \$3,600 per year. The wages of common deck hands are \$40 per month, or \$480 per year. In both cases board is included. Compare this with the miserable pittance on which our educated Missionaries are compelled to eke out a scanty subsistence.

We only add, that the Article, above alluded to, was, on its first appearance, most unjustly criticised, in the columns of one of our Church newspapers.

CATECHISINGS ON THE COLLECTS. By the REV. CHAS. F. HOFFMAN, A. M., Curate of St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J. Philadelphia: H. Hooker & Co. 1857.

An exceedingly plain, simple, and interesting method of indoctrinating children in the truths of our most holy Faith, and so of making them intelligent Christians. The principle of making the system of Sunday School instruction accord with the beautiful Order of our Ritual, is gaining in the Church. And yet, the indifference, and worse than indifference, of the Books of the American Sunday School Union, is still adhered to, and persisted in, by men who have taken upon them the vows of the Priesthood.

Will you then give your faithful diligence, always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same, according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge, with all diligence to keep and observe the same?

*Answer.* I will do so, by the help of the Lord.

Is this right? Is it honest? We need not ask, is it expedient? For expediency has nothing to do with the matter. Though, of course, what is right is always expedient.

REV. CHARLES BRECK'S FUNERAL SERMON, on the death of ALEXIS I. DUPONT, in Trinity Church, Wilmington, Del.

An appropriate tribute to a true-hearted son of the Church.

REV. JOS. JAMES RIDLEY'S Address to young men, in Trinity Church, Clarksville, Tenn., Aug. 30, 1857.

A bold appeal to young men in behalf of Christianity and the Church.

REV. MR. WASHBURN'S Convention Sermon at St. Paul's, New Haven, Conn., June, 1857. 8vo. pp. 18.

A heart-stirring appeal on "The Living Church."

REV. L. P. CLOVER'S Farewell Discourse, in St. John's Church, Johnstown, N. Y., 13th Sunday after Trinity. 1857. Published by request.

A beautiful and impressive discourse.

# ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

## SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

### ORDINATIONS.

#### DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Barnes, James L.	Potter, H.	Nov. 8,	Christ, Hudson, N. Y.
Cromlish, John,	Potter, A.	Sept. 17,	St. Peter's, Blairsville, Pa.
Earle, Wm. R.	Doane,	Oct. 13,	Christ Chapel, Elizabeth, N. J.
Esch, John Frederick,	Upfold,	Oct. 6,	St. James', Vincennes, Indiana.
Getz, Henry S.	Potter, A.	Oct. 11,	St. Paul's, Chester, Pa.
Gierlow, John,	Otey,	July 19,	Christ, Nashville, Tenn.
Gray, Joseph,	Otey,	July 19,	Christ, Nashville, Tenn.
Gorham, Wm. O.	DeLancey,	Sept. 23,	St. Peter's, Auburn, W. N. Y.
Loop, Charles F.	Hawks,	—, —,	—, —, St. Louis, Missouri.
Newlin, Joseph D.	Potter, A.	Sept. 21,	St. Mark's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Randall, Henry C.	Williams,	Oct. 29,	St. James', Poquetannock, Conn.
Spencer, Charles S.	Whittingham,	Sept. 20,	Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, Md.
Stow, William,	Clark,	Sept. 30,	Christ, Westerly, R. I.
Shipman, Jacob S.	DeLancey,	Sept. 23,	St. Peter's, Auburn, W. N. Y.
Van Antwerp, H. R.	DeLancey,	Sept. 23,	St. Peter's, Auburn, W. N. Y.

#### PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Barten, Otto-Sievers,	Potter, H.	Nov. 8,	Christ, Hudson, N. Y.
" Byllesby, Marison,	Potter, A.	Sept. 23,	—, Minersville, Pa.
" Coleman, T. K.	Whittingham,	Sept. 20,	Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, Md.
" Chittenden, R. L.	Whitehouse,	Nov. 11,	Trinity, Chicago, Ill.
" Dresser, D. W.	Whitehouse,	Oct. 21,	St. Paul's, Peoria, Ill.
" Latane, James A.	Meade,	Oct. 18,	Christ, Charlottesville, Va.
" Liggins, John,	Boone,	Jan. 11,	Mission Chapel, Shanghai, China.
" Mitchell, Walter A.	Doane,	Sept. 27,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
" McCormac, Johnston,	Scott,	Aug. 2,	Trinity, Portland, Oregon Ter.
" McClure, E.	McCoskry,	Nov. 18,	Christ, Adrian, Michigan.
" Nowlin, R. W.	Meade,	Oct. 30,	St. Mark's, New Glasgow, Va.
" Purviance, Charles,	Potter, H.	Nov. 8,	Christ, Hudson, N. Y.
" Wilbur, Sydney,	Smith,	Oct. 18,	Ascension, Frankfort, Ky.
" Williams, Pelham,	Burgess,	Sept. 23,	St. Philip's, Wiscasset, Me.
" Williams, C. Moore,	Boone,	Jan. 11,	Mission Chapel, Shanghai, China.

## CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Christ,	Potter, H.	Oct. 20,	Hudson, N. Y.
Christ,	Potter, H.	Oct. 22,	Greenville, N. Y.
Church of the Redeemer,	Potter, A.	Sept. 22,	Lower Merion, Pa.
St. John's,	Whitehouse,	Nov. 15,	Kewanee, Ill.
St. John's,	Williams,	Dec. 9,	New Haven, Conn.
St. Paul's Chapel,	Williams,	Dec. 10,	New Haven, Conn.
St. Paul's,	Whitehouse,	Oct. 11,	Manhattan, Ill.
St. Paul's,	DeLancey,	Oct. 14,	Oxford, W. N. Y.
Trinity,	Johns,	Nov. 28,	Washington, Va.

## OBITUARY.

DIED, the Rev. WILLIAM WHITE BOURS, Rector of St. John's Church, Jacksonville, Florida, at Jacksonville, Nov. 5th, aged 31 years.

Mr. Bours was born in Attica, N. Y., in 1826. He engaged early in life in mercantile pursuits in Geneva, N. Y., but in 1852 became a Candidate for Holy Orders, and was ordained Deacon, under the new Canon, in Trinity Church, Geneva, N. Y., Dec. 18, 1853, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop DeLancey. After assisting in St. Peter's Chapel, Geneva, and in St. James' Church, Syracuse, he sought a warmer climate, and became Rector of the parish in which he died. He was ordained Priest, Aug. 14, 1855, in Christ Church, Binghamton, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop DeLancey. In September last, he came to the North for his family; but hearing of the ravages of a *malignant fever* in his parish, hastened home, that he might be about his Master's business. He was constantly busy, visiting the sick, administering Baptism and the Holy Communion, burying the dead, and consoling the sorrowing. On the 27th of October, he wrote, "I am well, but very *tired* to-night." The next morning he attended two funerals, and then his strength gave way, and he needed the care which he had so freely given to others. One crisis was past on the third day, and hope revived, but on the fifth his freed spirit, dropping its earthly tabernacle, rested in the bosom of paradise. One says of him, "He was yet in his youth, but he was rich in the gifts of God's own Spirit, in faith, and hope, and charity; he matured rapidly under the pressure of holy influences. He won his people's love, and the admiration of all around him, by his frankness, his boldness in the cause of Christ, his entire devotion to his work, his warmth of heart, his earnestness in word and deed. The whole community felt their loss and mourned for him; *all* attended his funeral, and for a time, at least, an impression was made on minds and hearts which have long seemed insensible to the strivings of God's grace within them. May it become rooted and grounded in them forever. The idea expressed in one of his letters was realized: they begin to feel that the Church is 'a reality.' This was his aim always, to prove that the *faith* and *worship* of God in Christ are *realities*, the Pastor's office a real one, the *invisible* world 'no cunningly devised fable,' the Heaven of God's promise a true rest and home for the believing soul."

DIED in the Mission Home, at Cavalla, West Africa, June 13th, Rev. HUGH HAMILTON HOLCOMB, son of Lemuel C. Holcomb, of Granby, aged 32.

Mr. Holcomb was born in Granby, Conn., May 25th, 1825. He was educated by his father, a teacher of great experience and skill for literary eminence and professional success, and entered Washington, now Trinity College, in 1841. Leaving this institution in his senior year, he entered the senior class of Union College, Schenectady, and graduated with honor in August, 1845, at the age of 20 years.

For several years after leaving College, Mr. Holcomb resided in Washington, D. C., holding an office under the General Government and engaged in the study of the law. In 1852, he was admitted to the Bar in the District of Columbia.

Thus far, a career of literary, professional and political success seemed to open before him. But God's thoughts are not as our thoughts, nor His ways as our ways. His location at Washington brought him near a class of men at Alexandria, whose hearts God had touched with love for the souls of their fellow-men, perishing in heathen ignorance and sin. He made up his mind that there were honors of a more enduring kind, which every rational mind ought to prize, and that there were pursuits connected with the well-being of the soul in this world and the world beyond the grave, which men ought to estimate at their due.

Resolving to devote himself to the ministry and the cause of missions, he entered the Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., and passing through the three years' course of study, was ordained Deacon by Bishop Meade, June 29, 1855.

On the 14th of March, 1856, he sailed for Africa, and landed at Cape Palmas, June 13, just one year before his death. His short Missionary career was passed at Cavalla, where his modest, unassuming manner and great kindness, endeared him to all the members of the mission family. He took an active part in preaching amongst the natives, and in all duties assigned him.

Thus has there fallen, in the vineyard of his Master, another faithful laborer, who hesitated at no self-denial, who was discouraged at no sacrifices he was called to make. Having forsaken all for Christ, he labored in faith and hope for a short time for the good of Africa's children, and having calmly fallen asleep in Jesus, he now rests from his labors.

We have materials for a more extended obituary of the deceased, which, perhaps, could be better given to the Church in a different form.

DIED in the early part of November, the Rev. RICHARD F. CADLE, of the Diocese of Delaware.

In the removal from his earthly labors of Mr. Cadle, the Church has lost one of her oldest and most faithful missionaries. Prepared for the ministry under the oversight of the late Bishop Hobart, and ordained by him, he was for many years at the head of the Mission among the Oneida Indians at Green Bay, Lake Michigan, at the outset of our Missionary efforts.

In 1853, Mr. Cadle took charge of the Churches at Seaford, Laurel, and vicinity, in Sussex county, Delaware. In this extensive and arduous field his labors were unwearied. His holy life and kindliness of spirit, his interest in the young, and his assiduous attentions to the sick and the bereaved, won for him universal regard. In his intercourse with others, Mr. Cadle was eminently the Christian gentleman. As a preacher, he was fervent and impressive, shunning not to declare the whole counsel of God. As a pastor, he was affectionate and earnest. The sentiment of veneration and esteem for his character was not confined to the people of his own charge, but was shared by the whole community in which he resided, and was testified by the assemblage of sincere mourners at his funeral.

His last end was peace—his dying words, "the blood of Christ is sufficient for all things."

The funeral services were conducted in St. Luke's Church, Seaford, on Wednesday, Nov. 10th, by the Rev. Messrs. M'Kim, Martin and Wright, of Sussex county, an impressive discourse being delivered by the first named gentleman, to a very numerous and deeply affected congregation.

DIED in New York, October 10th, the Rev. ISAAC PARDEE, aged 53 years.

DIED at Holly Grove, Northampton County, Virginia, September 27th, the Rev. JOHN M. CHEVERS, Rector of Hungar's Parish, in the 27th year of his age.

Mr. Chevers was ordained Deacon by Bishop Meade, July 16, 1852, and Priest by Bishop Johns, at Lynchburg, Va., May 28, 1854.

During the three years he had the charge of Hungar's Parish, he succeeded in winning the confidence and esteem of all classes of the community, and was rapidly rising into a sphere of great usefulness.



DIED, at Arlington House, Va., Oct. 10, 1857, **GEORGE WASHINGTON PARKE CUSTIS**, in the 77th year of his age.

He was grandson of Martha Washington, by her first husband, John Parke Custis, and the only surviving member of the Washington family. When a child he was a member of Washington's household, and daily sat at his table. He possessed a strong taste for poetry and the fine arts, and his early speeches on the death of General Lingán, and the overthrow of Napoleon, are still remembered for the finished beauty of their conception, and their eloquence. As a connecting link between the past and the present, Mr. Custis has long been looked upon with much interest by his countrymen; and his boundless hospitality, intelligent liberality, and open, friendly manner towards all who happened to make his acquaintance, had secured him a host of friends. Nothing delighted him more than to contribute to the happiness of others in any way within his power. With fine conversational powers, and fond of talking of the early days of the Republic and the men of that time, no one ever failed to find him a most interesting and agreeable host and companion. He was married early in life to Miss Mary Lee Fitzhugh of Virginia, a lady of great excellence of character, who died in 1853.

Mr. Custis left but one child, a daughter, the wife of Col. Robert Lee, U. S. A., now serving at San Antonio, Texas. Mrs. Lee resides at Arlington, where she has long devoted herself to the duty of smoothing the declining years of her parents.

Arlington, the homestead estate of the family, lies on the south bank of the Potomac river, opposite Washington city, and above the bridge. It embraces about eleven hundred acres, left the deceased, we believe, by General Washington himself.

The funeral of Mr. Custis was on Tuesday, Oct. 13th, and was attended by numerous civic and military delegations, embracing many officers of the Army and Navy, members of the Bar, and a large concourse of distinguished citizens. The coffin was borne by a group of his own attached servants. The Rev. C. B. DANA, Rector of Christ Church, Alexandria, performed the services at the mansion and the grave, and, as his Pastor had also ministered unto the deceased during his illness. At Christ Church, Washington regularly worshiped, and the records of its Vestry attest the personal interest of the Father of his Country in sustaining the institutions of the Church. Mr. Custis was a thorough believer in Christianity, and a Communicant also in Christ Church, Alexandria.

DIED, at London, England, Oct. 10th, **THOMAS CRAWFORD**, the distinguished American Sculptor, aged 44 years.

He was born in New York city in 1813. His genius was of a high order, as his statue of Washington for the State of Virginia, his works in our National Capitol, his statue of Beethoven, &c., &c., abundantly testify. His funeral was attended from St. John's Chapel, New York city, Dec. 5th, and his remains rest in the beautiful city of the dead at Greenwood.

DIED, Nov. 21st, at Middlebury, Vt., **HON. HORATIO SEYMOUR, LL. D.**, aged 79 years.

He was born at Litchfield, Conn., May 31, 1778; graduated at Yale College in 1797, in a class distinguished for talent and scholarship; was a teacher for a while in the Episcopal Academy at Cheshire; was admitted to the Bar in 1800; and was a member of the Senate of the United States for twelve years from 1820. For many years he has been Senior Warden of the Parish at Middlebury, universally respected and esteemed for his great excellence and worth of character.

#### FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

The annual Meeting of the Board of Missions of the Church was held in St. Bartholomew's Church, New York, on Wednesday, Oct. 14, and continued until Friday, Oct. 16. There were present the Bishops of Virginia, of Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maine, South Carolina, North Carolina, Delaware, Califor-

nia, Iowa, the Assistant Bishops of Virginia and Connecticut, the Missionary Bishop of China, and the Provisional Bishop of New York. There was also present a pretty full representation of clerical and lay members from all parts of the Church.

The Report of the Foreign Committee was read by the Rev. Mr. DENISON. The receipts have been from Oct 1, 1856, to Oct. 1, 1857, \$70,673.60, of which there was contributed for

Greece, .....	\$ 496.67	
China, .....	8,042.28	
Africa, .....	19,599.13	
South America, .....	554.00	
Specific, .....	7,030.20	
General Fund, .....	34,951.32	\$70,673.60
Cash on hand last Oct., .....		379.23
		<hr/> \$71,052.83

Expenditures:

Greece, .....	3,345.01	
China, .....	27,223.79	
Africa, .....	27,461.95	
South America, .....	4.50	
Specific purposes, .....	7,346.25	
Publications, .....	3,610.61	
Salaries, .....	3,356.75	
Rent, .....	431.00	
Interest on loans, and discount on uncurrent money, bad bills, &c., .....	240.83	
Traveling expenses, .....	68.48	
Office expenses, foreign postage, &c., .....	292.90	
Returned balance of loan outstanding October 1, 1856, .....	500.00	73,882.07
		<hr/> \$2,829.24

In addition, \$20,000 have been paid as the Bohlen Gift for the special object of opening a new station in the interior of Africa, paid by the children of the late Mrs. Jane Bohlen, of Philadelphia, in accordance with her dying request.

Of the African Mission the summary of the statistics for the six months last received is:—

Communicants, .....	305
Confirmed, .....	75
Baptized (Infants 8,) .....	29
Native assistants, .....	18
Candidates for Orders, .....	5

Of the China Mission the statistics are:—

Clergy: Bishop, five Presbyters, and two (native) deacons, in all	8
Ordinations to Priest's Orders (Messrs Williams and Liggins,) . .	2
Baptisms since last report—Male 1, Female 4, (of whom three were from the girl's school,) .....	5
Confirmed, .....	5
Communicants, .....	29
Marriages, .....	2
Funerals, .....	3

In regard to South America, the opening seemed very promising, but the Committee had in vain sought for a laborer to occupy the ground.

The Greek Mission, now in its 27th year, was never more useful or successful.

The Rev. Dr. VAN KLEECK, Secretary, read the Report of the Domestic Committee. He gives the following table of Parishes and Contributions, which is valuable for future reference.

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTING PARISHES.

DIOCESES.	NUMBER OF CHURCHES CONTRIBUTING IN				AMOUNTS CONTRIBUTED IN			
	1854.	1855.	1856.	1857.	1854.	1855.	1856.	1857.
Maine, . . . . .	7	5	6	6	\$ 109.00	\$ 185.23	\$ 112.09	\$ 170.36
New Hampshire, . . . . .	8	7	8	8	202.83	233.20	186.80	222.78
Vermont, . . . . .	18	17	16	20	229.58	155.54	169.91	234.70
Massachusetts, . . . . .	22	24	42	28	1,243.40	1,451.97	1,792.43	1,641.74
Rhode Island, . . . . .	14	17	15	23	492.41	998.31	790.93	949.87
Connecticut, . . . . .	59	66	77	67	2,434.35	1,944.48	2,677.12	2,605.08
New York, . . . . .	132	119	135	137	9,236.42	9,455.23	12,428.12	21,776.61
Western New York, . . . . .	58	53	74	84	1,608.65	1,984.96	1,745.75	2,534.27
New Jersey, . . . . .	26	26	30	25	821.26	925.17	971.95	1,127.40
Pennsylvania, . . . . .	47	40	57	50	1,071.82	2,031.42	2,653.84	1,935.05
Delaware, . . . . .	13	10	11	18	155.98	135.85	218.20	383.86
Maryland, . . . . .	43	47	48	47	1,537.07	1,494.96	1,916.51	2,036.92
Virginia, . . . . .	26	32	36	53	781.24	1,122.92	1,194.78	1,702.25
North Carolina, . . . . .	19	11	22	27	825.78	518.23	650.41	771.43
South Carolina, . . . . .	26	28	29	32	1,952.26	1,601.40	2,123.74	1,774.98
Georgia, . . . . .	9	7	11	11	819.00	470.25	1,230.27	726.80
Florida, . . . . .	2	4	6	7	47.50	112.51	99.10	176.94
Alabama, . . . . .	7	10	19	19	192.55	313.70	598.67	751.20
Mississippi, . . . . .	2	10	10	11	485.00	674.30	387.50	674.65
Louisiana, . . . . .	5	4	6	14	146.05	88.70	184.00	446.59
Tennessee, . . . . .	4	5	12	11	277.00	118.00	326.28	468.29
Kentucky, . . . . .	4	8	8	9	146.05	143.90	190.45	480.07
Ohio, . . . . .	11	18	24	26	212.85	365.39	763.59	657.46
Indiana, . . . . .	10	11	17	16	97.80	78.90	222.58	201.00
Illinois, . . . . .	24	10	19	25	163.26	136.45	565.52	721.83
Michigan, . . . . .	22	11	20	18	366.19	524.27	361.51	793.11
Wisconsin, . . . . .	11	20	23	20	122.36	288.43	230.62	330.40
Minnesota, . . . . .	8	16	11	6	45.00	103.18	128.15	130.75
Iowa, . . . . .	1	2	11	5	3.00	29.00	219.51	294.66
Missouri, . . . . .	4	7	10	13	87.35	143.60	234.40	773.71
Arkansas, . . . . .	1	1	2	4	57.75	41.00	74.00	75.77
Texas, . . . . .	2	4	10	6	31.00	50.50	158.00	59.27
Indian Territory, . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	15.00	10.00	10.00
California, . . . . .	—	1	10	9	—	25.00	464.45	399.50
Oregon, . . . . .	—	1	—	2	—	15.00	—	152.00
Washington Territory, . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	54.00
Miscellaneous and Le- gacies, . . . . .	—	—	—	—	12,448.34	14,222.15	11,074.65	7,042.58
Totals, . . . . .	620	652	835	842	38,404.15	42,107.60	47,245.17	55,586.93

In the Domestic field, there are *four* Missionary Bishops and 128 Presbyters and Deacons; 12 stations are vacant; 41 missionaries have been added during the year; 22 have resigned. High character is given to the great body of Missionaries, for zeal and efficiency. The following table is interesting and valuable:—

State.	Sq. miles.	Population.
Maine, . . . . .	35,000	583,169
New Hampshire, . . . . .	8,030	317,976
Delaware, . . . . .	2,120	91,532
Georgia, . . . . .	58,000	906,185

State.	Sq. miles.	Population.
Florida, .....	59,268	87,445
Alabama, .....	50,722	807,337
Louisiana, .....	41,376	585,302
Mississippi, .....	47,151	606,526
Tennessee, .....	44,000	1,002,717
Ohio, .....	39,964	1,980,329
Kentucky, .....	37,680	982,405
Indiana, .....	33,809	988,416
Illinois, .....	55,409	1,306,576
Michigan, .....	56,243	509,377
Wisconsin, .....	53,924	552,109
Iowa, .....	50,914	326,014
Minnesota, .....	141,839	150,000
Missouri, .....	65,037	682,044
Arkansas, .....	54,500	342,905
Texas, .....	325,520	341,782
California, .....	188,982	264,445
Oregon and Washington, .....	323,821	60,000
Kansas, .....	122,000	50,000
Nebraska, .....	275,000	20,000
	2,170,309	14,244,582

All these are embraced in the present Missionary field.

As to funds, \$4798 40 have been received from legacies, \$2,899 70 from the Episcopal Missionary Association, for the West, with \$3,235 77, contributed to that association, together with various miscellaneous items. Total during the year, \$55,586 93. Debt last year between \$12,000 and \$13,000. Present liabilities \$9,762 14. Increase of receipts this year over last, \$8,341 76. The growth in amount is steady:—

1853, .....	\$23,856 43
1854, .....	38,404 15
1855, .....	42,107 60
1856, .....	47,245 17
1857, .....	55,586 93

The number of contributing parishes increases also, but slowly:—

1853, .....	506 Parishes.
1854, .....	620 "
1855, .....	652 "
1856, .....	835 "
1857, .....	842 "

The Annual Sermon was preached on Wednesday evening, by the Rt. Rev. BISHOP DAVIS, of South Carolina, from St. John xviii, 36.

The Meeting for public addresses was on Thursday evening in the Church of the Ascension; and addresses were made by Bishop KIP of California, the Rev. Dr. STEVENS, Bishop LEE of Iowa, the Rev. Dr. TYNG, and Bishop McILVAINE of Ohio.

On motion of Rev. Dr. STEVENS, it was ordered that the third resolution, relative to the missions in India, be transmitted to the Church Missionary Society and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, with a letter of sympathy from the Presiding Bishop.

The BISHOP OF PENNSYLVANIA, from the Committee appointed to fill vacancies, reported the following:

Rev. Mason Gallagher, of Western New York, *vice* Rev. Dr. Proal; Rev. C. T. Quintard, of Tenn., *vice* Rev. Charles Tomes; Dr. Benjamin McVickar, of Wisconsin, *vice* J. S. Colt, Esq.

On motion of Rev. Dr. TALBOT, it was referred to a special committee of seven to make inquiries as to the mode of conducting the Western Missions.

The Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Ohio, the Rev. Dr. Vinton of Boston, and the Rev. Mr. Gadsden of S. C., were appointed to issue a Special Appeal to the Church in behalf of the Board.

The Board adjourned to meet at Baltimore, on the second Wednesday in October, 1858.

In looking over the Reports made by the Secretaries of the Foreign and Domestic Boards, we are surprised at the small number of parishes which have contributed to either Board. Out of 2,024 parishes, only 843 give to Domestic, and only 846 to Foreign Missions. Nor is this all. Several of the wealthiest parishes in the country are put down, year after year, at sums disgracefully small. In amount of money given, New York heads the list; and Connecticut stands next. Still the good work is prospering and is beginning to reach the vast wealth which has hitherto been locked up against it.

#### CHURCH IN MINNESOTA.

The Primary Convention of the Church in Minnesota assembled at St. Paul, Sept. 16th, and continued in session three days. A Diocese was organized, a Constitution and Canons considered and adopted, Officers chosen, &c. Bishop Kemper was unanimously requested to continue his Episcopal oversight over the Diocese. The Constitution and Canons (prepared by the Rev. S. W. Manney) contain some new features, most of which were adopted. One Article of the Constitution, and a sound one, was laid over to the next Convention. It is in these words: "The Bishop being the principal order in the Convention, no act passed by the other two orders shall be valid and obligatory, without his approval, which approval shall be given at the time of the passage of the act."

In the organization of Parishes, by Canon VIII, "The Rector is *ex-officio* President of the Vestry, and a member of the same."

By Canon V, the right to vote at Parish Meetings is given to "all male adults who are communicants, or who have been baptized or confirmed, and regularly attend the public worship of the Church."

Canon VI, says: "As every consecrated Church is placed under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Diocese, it is hereby declared that in this spiritual jurisdiction is included the right of the Bishop to use such Church for all services not inconsistent with the 'Form for the consecration of a Church or chapel,' and to prevent its use for the performance of any service inconsistent with the same." "Whenever a priest is instituted or regularly settled in a parish or church, then the right of the Bishop to use such church for the performance of any Holy Office shall be confined to his visitations, and extraordinary occasions."

The ninth Article of the Constitution makes laymen members of the Standing Committee; but requires that they shall be communicants.

The thirteenth Article contains something new. It provides that "The Bishop and Clergy may sit as a distinct House; and as such shall be known as the Diocesan Synod; all whose duties and functions shall be defined and limited by Canon."

The Canon on the "Diocesan Synod" was laid over until the next Convention. The spirit of these features of the laws adopted by the Church in Minnesota, is as old as the Church herself, and we are glad to see a step in the right direction.

#### AN OLD VIRGINIA CHURCH IN RUINS.

A Virginia paper has the following. No comments are needed. If Virginia Churchmen can read such a story unmoved, we have nothing to say:

"A solitary traveler lately stopped his horse by the road-side, near the source of Potomac Creek, in Stafford County, Va., and fastening his horse to a tree, proceeded to force his way through a thicket of bushes and brambles which surrounded the massive walls of "old Potomac Church," rising in solemn majesty amid some giant forest trees, which the good sense and piety of some honest farmer left as a beacon to the taste of a generation that is no more.

"It was a sad scene. There within a short distance of several small frame houses, for worship, stood this magnificent old ruin, in solitary grandeur, a memento of the past. Washington, Madison and Monroe, no doubt often trod its courts, for it was on the direct route from their homes in youth, and the Capitol. Some master genius had planned and built it, for even in its ruins, it far surpasses all other old country Churches that we have seen in Virginia, or indeed in any State. And it may yet be filled with eager worshipers, if some pious hand could be found to re-roof its massive walls. Two thousand people could find ample standing room within its spacious courts, whose magnificent arches are exposed to the combined effects of the weather, the frost, and the outward pressure of a dissected roof."

#### ROMANISM IN NEW YORK CITY.

As one instance in which we see the workings of Popery strengthening itself in our large cities, we have the following:—Some time ago the Common Council of this city gave a large piece of city property to the Romanists, for a "Roman Catholic Asylum." Recently, Mr. Blunt applied to the Supreme Court, in behalf of the tax payers, to restrain the city corporation from transferring the land, and the asylum from receiving it. Judge Roosevelt refused to grant the injunction, but allowed an order to show cause why it should not be granted.

The property is of large value. The application to the court represents that the mayor, aldermen and commonalty of the city of New York, for the nominal consideration of one dollar, and without any real consideration, conveyed to the Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum Society in the city of New York, in fee, a piece of land fronting on the Fifth Avenue, extending from Fifty-first to Fifty-second street, and extending back from said avenue four hundred and fifty feet. That on the same day they leased to the said society, the residue of the said block, extending to the Fourth Avenue, and being of equal dimensions to the land conveyed in fee, for the yearly rent of one dollar, reserving, however, to the grantors, the right to terminate said lease at any time by resolution. That the part of the block thus leased, has now become of great value, viz, one hundred and fifty thousand dollars and upward; and that on the 15th day of last October, without the said lease having been rescinded, a resolution was passed by the Board of Councilmen, directing the Controller to execute a perpetual lease of the land to said society at a yearly rent of one dollar, which resolution was adopted by the Board of Aldermen on the 19th, and approved by the Mayor on the 21st of October.

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

The Board of Trustees of this proposed University met in session in St. John's Church, Montgomery, Ala., Nov. 25th. There were present the Rt. Rev. Bishops Atkinson, of N. C., Elliott of Ga., Green of Miss., Otley of Tenn., Polk of La., Rutledge of Fla., and Cobbs of Ala.; the Rev. Drs. Curtis of N. C., Pise of Tenn., Lay of Ala., and Scott of Fla.; the Rev. Messrs. Gregg of S. C., and Dunn of Texas, and Dr. Thomas D. Warren and Hon. Thomas Ruffin of N. C., Col. C. T. Pollard, and Dr. L. H. Anderson of Ala., Hon. F. B. Fogg of Tenn., Gen. Whitfield, and Hon. G. R. Fairbanks of Florida.

There were present, but not members of the Board, the Rev. Messrs. R. Johnson and William N. Hawks of Ga., John L. Gay and J. H. Ingraham of Tenn., R. A. Cobbs, R. D. Nevins, J. M. Mitchell, and E. Denniston, of Ala., and a goodly number of Laymen from several of the Dioceses interested in the enterprise. Also, Pres. Carnes, of Burritt College, Tenn.

The Committee on Location reported in favor of Suwanee Mountain, a beautiful plateau on the Cumberland range in Franklin Co., Tenn., about ten miles from the Alabama line, and near the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad; and this location, after fourteen ballots, was unanimously adopted.

A correspondent says: "A branch Railroad Company have generously given us 5000 acres of land for the location of our Institution, and in addition have made sundry liberal offers of coal and timber, and of gratuitous transportation on their

road. On this tract of land there are to be found in great abundance, every material for the building even of a large city. Besides sand and clay, and lime, the mountain top abounds with a heavy growth of both oak and pine, and its sides unfold quarries of the finest stone. Several varieties of this stone were exhibited to our Board, some of which were capable of receiving a marble polish. In the centre of this tract, and within a circle of a mile and a half diameter, are *twelve* springs of free-stone water, affording a sufficient supply for a population of ten thousand. The largest of these springs pours forth more than a thousand gallons to the hour; and is so elevated that its waters may be conducted by pipes to the second story of any of our contemplated buildings."

#### AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY AND ITS REVISED BIBLE.

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, was held at the Bible House, on Thursday, Nov. 12, where there was a discussion of intense interest and great importance.

Dr. Vermilye, from the Committee on Versions, read the report of that body, reciting the history of their work, &c., &c, closing with a resolution to re-commit the work for the purpose of revising the accessories to the text of the present revised edition.

Rev. Dr. Ferris moved the *acceptance* of the report.

Rev. Dr. McLane seconded the motion and added that the Committee have fixed opinions as to the headings, and are yielding much when they consent to revise their own work.

Rev. Dr. Tyng made a characteristic speech and defended the action of the Board.

Dr. Turner criticised the work of the Committee in some particulars, and sustained it in others.

Rev. Dr. Spring, Chairman of the Committee on Versions, made a powerful speech defending the right and propriety of all that had been done, and yet submitted a resolution, that the Society return to the edition of 1839.

Rev. Dr. Potts advocated a return to the old editions, denying the constitutional right and the expediency of the changes that have been made.

The Board then adjourned for one week. On Thursday, Nov. 19, the discussion was resumed.

Dr. Vermilye made an elaborate and able speech in defense of the revised edition, reciting the entire history of the work, and earnestly protesting against yielding to the pressure from without, by which the action is assailed. He contended that the opposition is local and not worthy of being regarded. The Episcopal Church, he said, is entirely satisfied, and so is the New School Presbyterian, and other large bodies, and the opposition is confined mainly to the Old School Presbyterian Church, who were led on by one man, &c.

Rev. Dr. Bedell of the Episcopal Church, wished to say that Dr. V. was altogether mistaken in assuming that the Church was pleased with the work. He had conversed with many; had traveled extensively; and did not know of but one (Rev. Dr. Tyng) who was satisfied. He mentioned Bishops McIlvaine, Eastburn, Burgess and Meade, as regretting the work, and declared the dissatisfaction to be deep and wide-spread.

Mr. Prime presented the recent action of the Synod of Pittsburgh, one of the largest bodies in the Old School Presbyterian Church, beseeching the Board to restore the Bible to its former condition in all matters affecting the sense.

Dr. Matthews spoke of the great dissatisfaction prevailing and the necessity of retrogression to prevent farther alienation.

Dr. McLane defended the revision, and so did Dr. Tyng and Dr. Storrs.

Dr. Muhlenburg submitted a proposition that we open a correspondence with the British and Foreign Bible Society in reference to a commission from all the churches of the Protestant, English-speaking world, to consider the question of revision.



Dr. Potts advocated prompt action to allay the increasing agitation of the popular mind. He called in question the constitutional right of the Society to alter the text, and showed that the opposition was not "unintelligent," as some had called it, or factious or sectarian, but was earnest, conscientious and extensive.

Finally, after much conversation, the presiding officers, four Vice Presidents, were directed to appoint a Committee of nine to whom the whole matter shall be referred to report at a future meeting of the Board.

There are two opinions widely prevailing, that unite a vast body of men, and among them the most learned, intelligent and earnest friends of the Society, in opposition to the recent revision of the Bible.

1. One opinion is that the Constitution restricts the Society to the publication of the Bible as it was at the formation of the Society. In the first article of the Constitution it is provided that

"The only copies in the English language, to be circulated by the Society, shall be of the version *now* in common use."

2. Another large, perhaps larger number of members, believe that it is highly inexpedient to disturb the public mind with the revision question when it is plainly impracticable for the American Bible Society under its present Constitution to make any important improvements in the translation.

#### FINANCIAL EMBARRASMENTS OF 1857.

Within thirty days previous to Oct. 20, the following railroad companies are reported to have either gone to protest on their floating debt, suspended, or made an assignment of their property:

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Total Liabilities.</i>
New York & Erie, .....	\$38,000,000
Illinois Central, .....	24,000,000
Philadelphia & Reading, .....	20,000,000
Michigan Central, .....	14,000,000
Michigan Southern, .....	18,000,000
Cleveland & Toledo, .....	7,500,000
Milwaukie & Mississippi, .....	7,000,000
La Crosse & Milwaukie, .....	14,000,000
Cleveland & Pittsburg, .....	6,000,000
Delaware, Lackawana & Western, .....	10,000,000
Chicago, St. Paul & Fond du Lac, .....	5,000,000
North Pennsylvania, .....	6,000,000
Cumberland Coal Company, .....	6,000,000
Huntingdon & Broad Top, .....	1,200,000
Steubenville & Indiana, estimated, .....	5,000,000
Total, .....	\$181,700,000

Of individuals, or of firms in business, the total number of failures, officially reported since the 1st of August, is about nine hundred. It is estimated that the total liabilities of these suspensions will amount to full ninety million of dollars. The want of employment and the great scarcity of money have brought great distress upon multitudes in the large cities and manufacturing towns.

In consequence of these embarrassments a number of the Rt. Rev. the Bishops of the Church, have set forth a special Prayer to be used at Morning and Evening Service, and have exhorted the Clergy to inculcate, both publicly and privately, the exercise of forbearance, patience, charity, and heavenly mindedness.

#### RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION OF SLAVES.

Aside from what we are doing for this class of the population of the South, we take the following from recent Reports:

**SOUTH CAROLINA.**—From the late Report of the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of South Carolina Conference of the Methodists, as published in the *Southern Christian Advocate* of Charleston, S. C., it appears that the "Conference began a regular system of ecclesiastical operations among the plantation negroes of the low country, twenty-six years ago; and that at the present time, there are twenty-six missionary stations, on which are employed thirty-two ministers. The number of church members is 11,546, including 1,175 whites. The missionary revenue has risen from \$300 to \$25,000."

**MISSISSIPPI.**—The Annual Report of the Missionary Secretary of the Mississippi Methodist Conference, gives the following interesting account of the work within its bounds: A most interesting department of our missionary work, looks to the religious training and teaching of the thousands of slaves which are found within the limits of the Mississippi Conference, and in our division of the Methodists.

The colored people generally receive our instructions gratefully, and many of them are soundly converted, live religiously, and die as none but Christians can die. Most of our missionaries are employed in this vast and widening field. The simple earnestness of our system suits their natures, and they are made better and happier.

All of our Domestic missions are represented as prosperous. In some of them gracious revivals have taken place. Not one of them is to be given up; and an increased demand is made for men to occupy this growing field.

Within the limits of the Conference there are in all—

Thirty-one missions. Twenty-four are filled by members of the Conference, the others by Local Preachers.

Eleven of these are wholly or in part to whites.

Twenty exclusively to the negroes.

Seven hundred and sixty-nine white members.

Four thousand five hundred and thirty-five colored.

There are one hundred and seventy-two preaching places.

Twenty-three hundred children are catechised.

Eighteen of these missions are self-sustaining.

Seven of them receive aid from the Parent Missionary Society, to the amount of \$2,100.

**ALABAMA.**—The proceedings of the Synod of Alabama (Old School Presbyterian) have been printed in pamphlet form. The Synod embraces four Presbyteries, fifty-one ministers, one hundred and one churches, and three licentiates, and seven candidates for the ministry. It met in Marion on the 19th of October.

They passed the following resolution presented by the committee of bills and overtures:

Synod are gratified in learning from the reports of the Presbyteries, that so generally special attention is paid to the spiritual wants of our colored population, both by direct preaching of the Word, and by Biblical and Catechetical instruction.

**GEORGIA.**—In Georgia the same influential body of Christians are persevering in the spiritual instruction of the slave population. In the Narrative of the state of religion in the Synod of Georgia, lately issued, the following testimony is borne to labors in behalf of children and servants:

From every quarter within the bounds of our Zion, the good tidings reach our ears that the Lambs of the Flock, together with the Domestics about our hearths, and the laborers upon our farms, participate largely in the toils and prayers of our ministers.

#### GERMAN INFIDELITY IN THE UNITED STATES.

An American writer uses the following language:

"To understand the subject, we must look at the actual state of things in the struggles for liberty in Europe in 1848 and 1849, when France became a republic,

and all Germany, as well as Italy and other countries, was agitated to its centre. As republicans, the American people sympathized with all who would throw off the yoke of oppression; but when it appeared, as it soon did, that many of the leaders in that struggle were Socialists, Communists, Agrarians, and Infidels, ready perhaps to re-enact the bloody scenes of the French Revolution; that the watchwords, 'Liberty, Fraternity, Equality,' meant liberty to sin and to violate every wholesome law of God and man, to use every one's property and person as unbridled licentiousness would require—we paused, and ceased to wonder that intelligent Christians of Continental Europe hesitated and stood back from the contest.

"Many of those who in 1848, were loudest in their clamor for 'Liberty, Fraternity, Equality,' are now inhabitants of the United States, and they find just as much here which they wish to revolutionize as they did at home. Instead of rejoicing in our political and religious freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, they make the public outcry in wide-spread Infidel periodicals, 'Americans are to some extent politically, free; but they are not so in religion; they are a priest-ridden, enslaved people; full freedom remains yet to be won! We will win that freedom, the freedom which was sought by Thomas Paine, not only from British rule, but from priestcraft and superstition,' both Papal and Protestant; and the birth-day of this vagabond drunkard, this outcast from civilized society, is celebrated at Cincinnati, at St. Louis, at Milwaukee, by torchlight processions, infidel speeches, feasting and dancing. These Infidels avowedly regret the smattering of religion found even in the Deism of Tom Paine—they call for *Pantheism* and *Atheism*. A leading German Infidel paper declares, 'It is indispensably necessary to throw off not only Christianity, but the so-called Deism, as an unworthy fetter, as a restraint no longer to be endured.'

"Seven German Infidel papers in this country, some of them with a weekly circulation of 4000, advocate this Pantheism or Atheism. Their main object is, not politics, but to assail the Bible and all forms of religion. One of the oldest of them goes so far as to recommend the *abolition of religious liberty*, declaring that where that liberty produces mischief, as it does in this country in the hands of the priesthood, it must be done away."

A German paper in St. Louis says:

"No individual can live as a human being; in no family can true happiness flourish; the whole human race is hastening on ways of error, so long as the (scheuszlichsten Popanze) most abominable hobgoblins—*God, future existence, eternal retribution*—are permitted to maintain their ghostly existence. It is, therefore, the great task of every genuine revolutionist to put forth his best powers for the destruction of this flagitious non-trio, viz: the hobgoblins of a God, future existence, and future rewards and punishments.

"Self-preservation is the first and most prominent instinct of every living creature, as well as of man. So soon as our relations assume the form stated above, (namely, so soon as want of employment and high prices of provisions ensue,) then this instinct of self-preservation makes its right effective, and the very natural impulse (Drang) is awakened to *fall to, seize hold and take, whatever is needful to life, especially bread and meat*. Laws, customs, morality, *religion*, and whatever these straight-jackets of social life may be called, have indeed considerably circumscribed this instinct of self-preservation, especially when it assumes the form of seizing hold of what others claim."

There are in this country Infidel Schools and Infidel Clubs, which patronize Infidel publications and spread systematically Infidel sentiments. In the Western States especially these efforts are abundant.

**THE GERMAN PRESS IN AMERICA.**—The Quincy Tribune gives a list of the German papers and periodicals which are published in the United States and Canada. The number given is 121, yet the list is by no means a complete one, and there may be twenty or thirty more. On an examination of the list, we find that there are 9 in Illinois, 3 in Iowa, 10 in Wisconsin, 9 in Missouri, 3 in Kentucky, 4 in Indiana, 1 in Michigan, 17 in Ohio, 18 in New York, 1 in New Jersey, 83 in Pennsyl-

vania, 3 in Maryland, 1 in Virginia, 1 in South Carolina, 2 in Louisiana, 3 in Texas, 1 in the District of Columbia, 1 in California and 5 in Canada West. The New England States have none.

#### OPPOSITION TO ENGLISH MISSIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA AND ITS ORIGIN.

The English Church has for many years been prosecuting the Missionary work vigorously and successfully in South Africa, where there are now *three* Missionary Bishops, more than *twenty* Presbyters, numerous churches, schools, &c. The Reports of these Missionaries speak of efforts unceasingly made to injure the Church by her enemies. There has lately been in the United States a Presbyterian Missionary from Natal, Rev. Wm. Campbell, and a strong effort has been made to secure men and money for his aid, and that of Presbyterian Missions in that country. The Rev. Dr. Anderson and others endorsed his application. Among other statements in his "Appeal" is the following, which our readers will readily understand.

"In this part of South Africa, there are several teachers of grievously unsound doctrine, and it seems to us important that their influence should be counteracted by an increased number of faithful evangelical ministers, whose labors among the colonists would, we doubt not, have a happy influence on our own among the heathen."

#### CHRISTIANITY IN CONGRESS AND PARLIAMENT.

A correspondent of a London paper says that during his visit of six hours in the gallery of the House of Lords he heard more religious speaking, more said "for Christ and the Gospel, than there has been spoken in both houses of Congress for forty years."

We do not doubt the truth of this statement. With all our boasted "reforms" and noisy pharisaism, and mawkish philanthropy, and sickly sentimentalism, everything like a positive Christianity, or a distinctly defined doctrine of the Cross, is dying out; and would, we fear, even now, be scouted from our Congressional Halls.

### SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

#### DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF ANTIGUA.

THE RIGHT REV. DANIEL GATEWARD DAVIS, D. D., Bishop of Antigua, expired suddenly, from disease of the heart, at his residence in Bryanston street, London, Oct. 25th. Dr. Davis was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1814, and after filling various offices in the Church at home, was, with four others, consecrated in Westminster Abbey in 1842. The Diocese is worth £2,000 a year, from the Consolidated Fund. It is in extent seven hundred and fifty-one square miles, with a population of one hundred and five thousand. It comprises Antigua, Nevis, St. Christopher's, Montserrat, the Virgin Islands, and Dominica. The nomination of the Bishop's successor is with Mr. Labouchere, the Colonial Secretary, by whom it has been conferred upon Venerable Hugh Willoughby Jermyn, M. A., Archdeacon of St. Christopher's. The Archdeacon was educated at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1841. After holding some small appointment in the Church, he was nominated to the incumbency of the Parish of Forres, Scotland, and subsequently to the deanery of Moray and Ross. This he resigned in 1854, on being appointed to the Archdeaconry of St. Christopher's.

## CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF HURON.

The Rev. BENJAMIN CRONYN, D. D., of London, C. W., was consecrated Bishop of Huron, (this instead of "London" being finally settled as the name of the new Diocese formed out of Toronto,) in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Wednesday, Oct. 28th, the Festival of St. Simon and St. Jude, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, aided by the Bishops of Winchester, Nova Scotia, and Sierra Leone. The Sermon was preached by Rev. Hamilton Verschoyle, M. A. of Dublin, Ireland, from Rom. i, 16.

## CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF SIERRA LEONE.

On Sunday, Sept. 20th, the Rev. JOHN BOWEN, LL. D., was consecrated Bishop of Sierra Leone; the solemn rite being celebrated in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by the Bishops of Peterborough and Victoria.

The new Bishop of Sierra Leone passed several years of his early life in the Canadas. He was ordained in 1846 or '47, to the curacy of Knaresborough, on the nomination of the Rev. Andrew Cheap, who was then Rector, having previously graduated at Trinity College, Dublin. In 1849 he visited Palestine under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society, in a Missionary capacity, though at his own expense, and thence proceeded to several countries in the East. He remained in Nineveh, Babylon, and Egypt, two or three years. On his return to England he was presented to the rectory of Orton Longville, by the Marquis of Huntley. In 1854, he again visited the scene of his former labors, and preached the Gospel in Arabia and in Nazareth, and other places, where he gathered together little bands of Christians. He returned to England last year, and has since resided on his living; but it being but of small population he has made frequent tours, to stir up others on behalf of the Church Missionary work. Bishop Bowen is a man of independent fortune, his seat is Milton-house, Pembrokeshire, where he has considerable property.

## THE COLONIAL EPISCOPATE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The Church of England will, in the course of a few weeks, have thirty-seven Bishops in the Colonies and Dependencies of the British crown. There are at present thirty-three English Colonial Bishops, viz: Dr. Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta; Dr. Strachan, Bishop of Toronto; Dr. Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand; Dr. Parry, Bishop of Barbadoes; Dr. Tomlinson, Bishop of Gibraltar; Dr. Davis, Bishop of Antigua; Dr. Austin, Bishop of Guiana; Dr. Nixon, Bishop of Tasmania; Dr. Spencer, Bishop of Jamaica; Dr. Feild, Bishop of Newfoundland; Dr. Medley, Bishop of Fredericton; Dr. Chapman, Bishop of Colombo; Dr. Perry, Bishop of Melbourne; Dr. Gray, Bishop of Cape Town; Dr. Short, Bishop of Adelaide; Dr. Tyrrell, Bishop of Newcastle; Dr. Anderson, Bishop of Rupert's Land; Dr. Smith, Bishop of Victoria; Dr. Dealtry, Bishop of Madras; Dr. Mountain, Bishop of Quebec; Dr. Fulford, Bishop of Montreal; Dr. Binney, Bishop of Nova Scotia; Dr. Harding, Bishop of Bombay; Dr. Colenso, Bishop of Natal; Dr. Barker, Bishop of Sydney; Dr. Ryan, Bishop of Mauritius; Dr. Bowen, Bishop of Sierra Leone; Dr. McDougall, Bishop of Labuan; Dr. Hale, Bishop of Perth; Dr. Courtenay, Bishop of Kingston; Dr. Harper, Bishop of Christ Church, New Zealand; Dr. Cotterell, Bishop of Graham's Town; and Dr. Gobat, Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem. To these will very shortly be added, by consecration, Dr. Cronyn, who has been elected Bishop of Huron, Upper Canada; Mr. Hobbhouse, who has been designated to the Bishopric of Nelson, New Zealand; Archdeacon Hadfield, who has been designated to the Bishopric of Wellington; and Archdeacon Williams, who has been designated to the Bishopric of Taurangar, an exclusively Maori district. As soon as tranquillity is restored in India, arrangements will be completed for the establishment of three new Bishoprics there—one at Agra, for the Northwest Provinces; one at Lahore,

for the Punjaub; and one at Palamcottah, for the Missionary Province of Tinnevely. When these appointments are made, the number of English Colonial Bishops will be forty.

#### NEW CHURCH MOVEMENT FOR INDIA.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, have drawn up a statement anticipatory of the meeting to be presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a view to the extension of the Episcopate in India, upon which the appeal to the public in aid of the new movement will be based. This statement has received the sanction of the Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, the Duke of Buccleuch, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Harrowby, Earl Nelson, Lord Lyttelton, Lord Wensleydale, Mr. Gladstone, M. P., Mr. Justice Coleridge, Vice-Chancellor Sir W. Page Wood, Sir John Patteson, M. P., Mr. Mowbray, M. P., Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, the Dean of Westminster, the Dean of Norwich, the Dean of Canterbury, Mr. Fuller, M. P., Sir H. Dukenfield, Archdeacon Hale, Archdeacon Sinclair, and other noblemen and gentlemen who compose the Council of the Society. They stated that the See of Calcutta was erected in 1814, and that in 1834 an Act of Parliament was passed, enabling the Crown to erect two new Sees at Madras and Bombay. The extreme length of the Diocese of Calcutta, in a straight line from Peshawur to Singapore, is nearly three thousand miles, almost as great as the distance from London to Jerusalem. It is proposed to subdivide this Diocese by the erection of two additional Sees—one for the Northwest Provinces and another for the Punjaub. The Northwest Provinces, with Oude, would form a Diocese about five hundred miles in length, and contain an area of one hundred and nine thousand square miles, with a population of thirty-four million—a Diocese which would be nineteen thousand square miles larger than the whole of Great Britain. The Diocese for the Punjaub would be almost as large as Great Britain, its extreme length from Umballah to Peshawur, being about four hundred and seventy miles, and its area eighty-six thousand square miles, with a population of thirteen million. It is also proposed to subdivide the Diocese of Madras, by the erection of a See near Tinnevely, the most southern district of India. The Bishop would be a Missionary Bishop living in the middle of a Diocese where there are few Europeans, and of which almost every part would be within a day's journey. The income required for such a See would be much less than in the case of a Bishop residing at Madras or Bombay, with vast distances to travel in every direction. There can be no doubt (says the official statement) that if her Majesty's Government shall think fit to recommend the appointment of a Bishop for Tinnevely, the necessary funds will be cheerfully contributed by the supporters of English missions. The three Bishoppries, therefore, which the meeting on the 26th of Nov. was to recommend for immediate formation, are, one at Agra, for the Northwest Provinces; one at Lahore, for the Punjaub; and one at Palamcottah, for the Missionary Province of Tinnevely.

#### RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF THE MUTINY IN INDIA.

Wednesday, Oct. 7th, was generally observed in England, as a day of Fasting and Humiliation over the awful calamities in India. The gross neglect of its Christian duty on the part of the Government, was boldly declared.

In a Sermon, in St. Paul's, London, Rev. Canon Dale said: "More than half a century had elapsed since the establishment of British supremacy in India, when it was declared by one of the most eloquent orators who ever pleaded the cause of the oppressed, that if our Indian conquests were to be as suddenly lost as they had been speedily acquired, not a trace would remain to show that Pagan India had ever been held in subjection by a professedly Christian nation."

In Westminster Abbey, the Very Rev. the Dean said, alluding to the opium traffic, "It was a hideous fact that the Government of India raised a revenue of some millions from trafficking in this poisonous drug, which was so destructive

both to the body and soul of millions in the East. The East India Company annually exported 100,000 chests of opium, forcing it upon unwilling nations, upon China above all, despite of their laws and their remonstrances. This was the crying sin, but it was ours also, for the Government of England was so constituted and so responsive to the national views and feelings, that whenever the people of England were resolved that this thing shall not be or that other thing shall, those who administered their affairs were bound to put the resolution into effect."

At Christ Church, Hoxton, Rev. W. Scott said: "Such a day as this must do us as a Christian people, much good, but the days of fasting should be attended by a proper spirit, lest we should add sin to sin. Our Indian empire was annexed by a trading company, a commercial company on a large scale. It profits us little to talk of Clive, Hastings, and annexation of kingdom after kingdom and state after state. What better is the Hindoo for having been under British rule for about a century! They are as brutal and atrocious now as they were, and we now feel the disasters resulting from our neglect of teaching them."

At St. Philip's, Clerkenwell, the Rev. W. B. Wroth, said: "While a Christian Government should avoid offending needless prejudices, two things might at least be expected of it. First, that it should sternly forbid everything opposed to sound morals and humanity; and, secondly, that it should not directly or indirectly encourage heathenism. The heathen would have more confidence in us if we showed by our deeds that we believed the Christianity we professed. We had taught them the art of war, and they used their knowledge against their teachers; but we had not taught them the law of Christian love, and terribly had our neglect been visited on us. We had now an opportunity of showing that we were actuated by the spirit of love, at least to our own flesh and blood."

At these services collections were taken in behalf of the sufferers in India, and the Indian Relief Fund already amounts to more than £200,000.

In some quarters the Romanists not only refused to recognize the day, but have fairly gloated over the hellish scenes of violence, carnage, and lust.

The venerable Bishop of Calcutta, in a Sermon in his Cathedral, on the 24th of July, said: "It has long appeared to thoughtful persons that one of the chief sins of India is the close connection with the vices and idolatries of Brahminism, and the detestable licentiousness and bitter hatred to Christianity of the followers of the False Prophet. In this opinion I concur. . . . We have a hundred years of offenses to answer for, those of Lord Clive and Mr. Warren Hastings, as well as of our rulers since. I fear we have too much continued in the spirit, if not in the acts, of our fathers. Even in our own times, I remember well the struggle of twenty long years, under the great and eminent Wilberforce, that was necessary to secure a free admission of our missionaries into India. I remember the cruel treatment of Dr. and Mrs. Judson, whom I knew at Moulmein—the forced resort of Dr. Carey and his pious companions to the Danish settlement of Serampore—the prohibition to Dr. Buchanan to publish his sermons on the Prophecies—the disgraceful delay in disconnecting Government with the pilgrimages to Juggernaut—and the salutes to idols and other ceremonies at Madras, which compelled the brave and noble Sir Peregrine Maitland to resign. Even my friend and brother, Bishop Corrie, was rebuked by the Madras Government in 1836, for the mildest exercise of what he considered his appropriate duty in expressing his sympathy with Sir Peregrine on that occasion. . . . Another subject of deep anxiety to the Christian mind is the connection of our Government with the opium traffic. We seem to have been gradually entangled in a system of measures by which we are administering this drug to the ignorant heathen of China in a manner directly contributing to destroy their bodies and souls by thousands and tens of thousands. No doubt her Majesty's Government at home has a large share in this guilt. . . . Another sin weighing on the neck of India is the favor shown to the anti-social and anti-Christian civil system of caste. It is as much a degradation of a large part of the human species as the old exploded theory of the natural inferiority of the negro race. I conceive it is contrary to the whole spirit of British jurisprudence, as well as to the laws of God, to recognize such a theory."



Should, therefore, these terrible scenes in India have the effect to arouse the Christian conscience of England to a sense of the neglect of the past, and lead the Government to at least withdraw its countenance from heathen and Mohammedan idolatry, and to offer free toleration to the religion of the Cross, one great end will have been gained by this sacrifice.

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

Now that all eyes are turned toward British India, a brief historical notice of the gigantic corporation that controls the destinies of so many millions in that far distant country, will be interesting. We clip the following from the Canadian *Merchants' Magazine*:

"Two hundred and fifty-three years ago, some traders in London united together to raise a capital of £30,000, wherewith to trade to the East Indies. They obtained a charter, under which the management of their affairs was entrusted to a committee of twenty-four of their members, chosen by themselves. In 1624, authority was granted to the company by the king to punish its servants abroad, either by civil or military law. In 1661, a new charter was granted, by which the company was allowed to make peace or war with or against people or princes, not Christians, and to seize all unlicensed persons, and send them to England. Other parties attempted to get into the trade by bribing the various governments of the day; at one time, when the old company offered to loan the government £700,000 at four per cent., their rivals offered £2,000,000 at eight per cent. In 1708 the rival companies united, and by a loan of £1,200,000 to the government, without interest, purchased further privileges, which have been the basis of their subsequent charters. In 1784 a new feature was introduced into the system—that of the Board of Control, by which in effect, the political power (though under the name of the government) was vested in the directors. In 1813 the trade to India was thrown open, and in 1833 the trade to China was not only made free, but the company was precluded from commercial operations; and thus we find that the functions for which it was originally organized ceased altogether, and by a combination of circumstances, it had gradually assumed others of a most anomalous description; when, in 1853, a committee of twenty-four private gentlemen were absolute sovereigns of one hundred millions of people."

#### CHURCH SYNODS IN AUSTRALASIA.

It will be remembered that as far back as 1850, the six Bishops of Australasia expressed their opinions on the importance and necessity of establishing Provincial and Diocesan Synods for regulating the affairs of the Church.

Synods have been established in three out of the six Dioceses whose Bishops met in 1852, in Melbourne, Adelaide and New Zealand; in Tasmania the first step has been taken, and in Sydney and Newcastle alone has nothing been done. They had the precedents of other colonies before them, sanctioned by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Bishop of SYDNEY declines to act at present, and a spirited meeting of clergy and laity has been held in his Diocese on the subject, Rev. Canon Walsh in the chair.

In NEW ZEALAND the Church Conference has agreed to the following resolutions respecting the future ecclesiastical government of the Church in the Dioceses of those islands:

1. That the Clergy, Bishops and laity vote in this Conference as three distinct orders, an actual majority in each order being necessary to carry any question.

2. That any system of Church government in this colony should emanate from the Church itself, and be founded on the principle of a voluntary compact; and in the case of its being found necessary, then that application be made to the Colonial Legislature for legal powers enabling the body to hold property.

3. That the governing body should consist of three orders, viz, Bishops, Clergy and laity, and that the consent of an actual majority of each order should be necessary to the validity of its rules.

4. That the name of this governing body be "the General Synod of the United Branch of the Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand."

5. That the constitution of Diocesan Synods should be similar to that of the General Synod, but that the question of an appeal to the General Synod, from the veto of any one order, should rest with each Diocese to decide for itself.

6. That it shall rest with the General Synod to determine on what principle all patronage shall be exercised in the several Dioceses.

7. That, saving the rights of the Church and the Crown, the nomination of a Bishop shall lie with the Synod of the Diocese, to be sanctioned by the General Synod, and by it to be submitted to the authorities of Church and State in England for their favorable consideration.

[This was framed in accordance with the suggestion of H. M. Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Labouchere, in his letter to the Governor-General of Canada, as seen in page 50 of the *New Zealand Church Almanac* for 1857.]

8. That the mode of administering discipline towards all persons in holy orders, in this branch of the Church, shall be decided by the General Synod.

9. That the branch of the Church in this colony doth hold the Christian doctrine and sacraments as the United Church of England and Ireland doth explain the same.

10. That the General Synod of this branch of the Church of England hath no power to make any alterations in the Authorized Version of the Scriptures, the Book of Common Prayer, the Ordination Service, or the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

11. Provided that nothing herein contained shall prevent the General Synod from accepting any alterations of the above-named formularies and version of the Bible, as may from time to time be adopted by the United Church of England and Ireland, with the consent of the Crown and of Convocation.

12. Provided, also, that in case a license be granted by the Crown to this branch of the Church of England to frame new and modify existing rules (not affecting doctrine,) with the view of meeting the peculiar circumstances of this colony and the native people, then that it shall be lawful for this branch of the said Church to avail itself of that liberty.

13. Provided, also, that in case (which case they strongly deprecate) of a separation of the colony from the mother country, or a separation of Church and State in England, it be lawful for the General Synod to make such alterations as the altered circumstances shall require.

14. That the doctrines taught by the Bishops, Clergy, catechists, and school-masters, wholly or partially endowed and maintained by the proceeds of property held under this constitution deed, shall not be repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England; and that it shall be the duty of the trustees of such property to obey all such instructions as shall from time to time be issued to them by the General Synod for the purpose of guarding the trusts from being applied to the inculcation of doctrine repugnant to that of the Church of England.

15. That a select committee be appointed to prepare a draft report, showing the grounds on which the conference had been led to the conclusion that it was expedient to organize the members of the Church of England in this colony for the purpose of self-government, as a branch of the said Church, and the reasons which have influenced the conference in agreeing to the resolutions which have been passed with a view to that object.

16. That the General Synod shall have power to make any regulations controlling and superseding any regulations which may have been made by any diocesan Synod.

17. That a tribunal shall be constituted in New Zealand by the General Synod, to decide as to the repugnancy or otherwise of any doctrines taught by persons under their authority, to the doctrines of the Church of England.

18. That the conference recommended the Constituent Assembly to appoint some Court of Appeal from the tribunal referred to in the preceding resolution.

19. That a General Synod be held at least once in three years, at such time and place as shall be appointed by the General Synod.

20. That any act that shall have obtained the consent of all the diocesan Synods shall be taken and be an act of General Synod; provided always that it be not an act repealing or altering an act of the General Synod.

21. That, subject to such limitations as may from time to time be prescribed by the General Synod, every male of the age of twenty-one years and upwards who shall sign a declaration that he is desirous of uniting himself with the members of this branch of the Church of England, under the provisions of this constitution, shall, if duly registered for that purpose, be entitled to a vote at the election of a lay representative for the General Synod.

22. That as it appears to the conference desirable that the members of the Church of England in this colony should be united together as a branch of the said Church, and that a representative governing body, or General Synod, should be established for the management of the affairs of said branch, in order to avoid delay in the inauguration of the said General Synod, the conference do now proceed to act as a constituent assembly, and to prepare measures necessary for carrying the above-mentioned objects into effect.

Besides the Bishops of New Zealand and Christ Church, the assessors present were—Clergy: Archdeacons Henry Williams, William Williams, Hadfield, Abraham, and Paul; the Rev. G. A. Kissling, and the Rev. James Wilson. Laity: Messrs. Hirst, Swainson, Stafford, Tancred, Haultain, and Prendergast.

#### CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.—ELECTION OF A NEW PRIMUS.

The stated annual meeting of General Committee of the Scottish Episcopal Church Society was held in the Hall, 51 George Street, Edinburgh, on Wednesday, 30th September, 1857, at twelve o'clock, previous to which there was Morning Prayer in St. John's Episcopal Church. Prayers were said by the Rev. Daniel Fox Sandford. The Lessons were read by the Very Rev. Edward Bannerman Ramsey, Dean of Edinburgh; the Right Rev. Charles Hughes Terrot, D. D., Bishop of Edinburgh, and *Primus*, officiated at the Communion Service, at which an Offertory was made in aid of the funds of the Society.

There were present the Right Rev. Bishop of Edinburgh, *Primus*; the Bishops of Argyll, Brechin, Glasgow, Moray, St. Andrews and Aberdeen; the Very Rev. Deans of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Moray, and Aberdeen; the Venerable Archdeacon Aitchison; the Rev. T. Wilkinson, H. M. Inspector of Schools; the Honorable and Rev. H. Douglas; the Honorable G. F. Boyle; Sir James Cochrane, Chief Justice of Gibraltar; John Stirling, Esq., of Kippendavie; Alex F. Irvine, Esq. of Drum; William Forbes, Esq. of Medwyn; R. Robertson Glasgow, Esq. of Mountgrennan; and a numerous body of Clergy from all parts of Scotland; and H. J. Rollo, W. S. Secretary and Treasurer.

Prayers having been said by the Right Rev. Bishop of Edinburgh,

The Bishop of Brechin said he had to make an announcement, which he was sure would be received with great pleasure by all present, and especially by those belonging to the Diocese of Edinburgh, that yesterday, in consequence of the death of Bishop Skinner, it fell to the Synod of Bishops to elect a new *Primus*, on which occasion the Synod unanimously elected Bishop Terrot in his place.

The meeting was a spirited one. Measures are being taken to make up to the Church by donation the loss in the withdrawal of the Royal Gift, which was £1,200 a year. About £12,000 are already subscribed.

At a meeting of the "Scottish Episcopal Church Society" in Inverness, Sept. 16, the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Moray and Ross gave the following historical sketch of that Church.

"The time was, as you all well know, when our Church was in Scotland what the Church of England is now in England, the Established Church of the country. The social, religious, and political troubles which agitated Scotland during many years subsequent to the Reformation, and more especially during the period of the Great Rebellion, pressed so heavily upon the fortunes of our Church that it became necessary for us to recover the succession of our Episcopate

through the Church of England. This was accomplished for us at the beginning of the reign of Charles the Second. Episcopacy was restored, and the Reformed Church of Scotland became the *Established* Church of Scotland; and so she continued until the Revolution in 1688, when, on the abdication of James the Second in favor of his son, and on the establishment of William the Third on the British throne, the alternative was left to her of taking the oath of allegiance to the new King or of forfeiting her position as the Established Church of the country. Whatever opinion may now be formed by some as to the wisdom or necessity of the step which the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church felt constrained to take in these trying circumstances, those who have approved and appreciated the disinterestedness of those Ministers and Laymen who, a few years since, severed themselves from the present Establishment in Scotland, cannot fail to appreciate the like disinterestedness, and yet greater sacrifices made and manifested in 1689, when the fourteen Bishops and Archbishops, together with the great body of the Clergy of the Church of Scotland, surrendered, not only rank and station, but in many hundred instances all that they possessed, rather than be guilty, as they believed, of breaking the oath of allegiance which they had already sworn to the successors of the abdicated King. The Government seized the Episcopal and Capitular property; Presbyterian Ministers succeeded to the livings vacated by the Clergy, and from that time Presbyterianism became the Established religion of Scotland.

Though thus deprived, for conscience' sake, of all its wealth and honors, the Church still survived. It struggled on in poverty and dependence until a yet heavier blow fell upon it. After the '45 the anger of the Government fell upon the Episcopalians, as the members of the old Church were called, and statutes of the most penal character were passed, forbidding more than four Episcopalians to meet together for common worship, over and above the members of the family. Any Clergyman officiating where more than four were present, was sentenced to six months' imprisonment—and for a second offense was transported for life. No Scottish Peer who attended such a service could be elected a Representative Peer, or could vote for one. No Layman, guilty of a like offense, could be elected a member of Parliament, or vote for one, or could hold or vote for any municipal office. The effect of such severe and crushing statutes told heavily upon the already impoverished Church; and at the end of more than forty years, during which these statutes were in operation, the old Church of Scotland was nearly annihilated; for in the year 1792, when these statutes were repealed, her 14 Prelates were reduced to 6, and her Congregations to between 30 and 40. Her preservation at all, under such circumstances, could be attributed to the finger of God alone. She was the same Church as before—her doctrine and discipline unchanged; she was no new Church in Scotland, but the same old Church 'cast down, but not destroyed.'

Within the last eighteen years, the Church Schools in Scotland have increased from *seven to eighty*; and the Congregations from *seventy-six to one hundred and fifty*.

#### RELIGION IN GERMANY.

A gentleman every way qualified to form an opinion, lately in Germany, thus writes to an American religious paper, from Nuremberg:

"I learned from my ministerial friend that his flock consisted of twenty hundred souls, of whom fifty or a hundred attended church. He remarked that it was difficult to do anything, and was much discouraged. Immorality, exceedingly gross, one-third of the new population being illegitimate; no regard paid to the Sabbath, or sacred things; poverty and suffering abounding everywhere—one would think he had cause of sorrow. And yet it is only the same story that I hear everywhere in Germany. \* \* \* \* \* This, to one who feels a universal brotherhood in men, dispels the romance associated with the name of Germany in the new world. Sad, indeed, is the fate of the German people, and darker, still darker grows the future. God only knows what the end shall be."

It may be safely said that in Germany the Reformation has proved a miserable failure; and whether that country deserves to be called a Christian country is hardly an open question.

The following is perhaps a little more hopeful: A European correspondent of the *Congregationalist* describes an interview with Tholuck, in which the latter referred to his earlier lectures at the University of Halle. He said: "When I came here, all the professors were Rationalists, and all the students bitterly opposed to evangelical religion. It was very trying to be compelled to lecture to those who doubted, and disbelieved, and opposed all you said, and who would receive the most sacred things with derision. Often I have read my *heft* with the tears flowing down my face behind it. One day I spoke of the fact that the pious professors who founded this University, and taught here first, Spener and Francke, and the rest, used to meet once a week to pray for the conversion of the students, and the story was received with a shout of laughter from the whole four hundred students in the room. O, it went to my heart." He spoke of his gratitude to God, that things have so much changed now, and that he had the labor and sorrow in his youth and rest in his old age. In reply to a question, How many now are Christians? he said, "Probably all acknowledge the Bible to be the word of God, and out of the four hundred students (in theology,) perhaps one hundred and fifty are serious. But we cannot say how many are truly converted."

#### FRANCE.

Our London papers of Sept. 16, bring accounts of the death, at Paris, of M. AUGUSTE COMTE, aged 60 years; the ablest Exponent of the "Positive Philosophy," and whose works, edited by Miss Martineau, have been published in New York by Mr. Blanchard. M. Comte's first cardinal error, after his rejection of Revelation, is his application of the inductive method to ethics and religion in all its length and breadth. The result to which he comes is not only grossly infidel, but absolutely atheistic. And yet this same method of reasoning, the inductive, underlies nearly all the anti-Church and anti-Sacrament teaching of the day. It is the natural reaction from Scholastic and Romish dogmatism. There is more in this fact than lies upon the surface.

#### SPAIN.

A new Ministry has at length been formed. Martinez de la Rosa is first Secretary of State to the Queen, and Minister of Foreign Affairs; Joseph Casans, Minister of Justice; Finance, M. Mon; Navy, Admiral Bustillos; Interior, Bermudez de Castro; Public Works, Salaverria; War, Admiral Armerq, President of the Council. The Admiral has been twice Minister of the Navy, in 1840 and in 1848. M. Salaverria has held the position of Minister of Finance in the Cabinet presided over by General O'Donnell. All the members of the new cabinet belong to the liberal conservative party.

#### ROMANISM AND RATIONALISM IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

The looseness with which the reins of discipline are held in the State-bound Church of England, have led to the holding and the teaching of errors there, such as would not be tolerated for a moment in our own Church.

Here is an example in one direction. At the late Evangelical Alliance, at Berlin, an English Clergyman, after complimenting the rationalist, Chevalier Bunsen, and adverting to the approaching union of the two Royal families, stated the "desire felt in England for a union also of English and German theology. People in England had for a long time been horrified at the idea of German theology being introduced there; but now they were as desirous of learning divinity from German theologians as of receiving instruction in science at the hands of German investigators."

Nor is this all. We learn that the Dean of Canterbury, and the Rev. Messrs.

Brook and Carr Glynn, of the Church of England; Dr. Steane and Rev. Baptist Noel, of the Baptist denomination; Rev. Mr. Scott, a Wesleyan; and the Rev. Mr. Sherman, an Independent minister, divided with each other the labors of celebrating the sacramental rite of the Holy Communion. The heresies and infidel speculations of such men as Macnaught, and Jowett, and Maurice, &c., have been alluded to in our previous pages.

Here is an example of another kind. The *Union Newspaper*, conducted by a Romanizing party in the English Church, lately had the following, and much more of the same sort: "Pardon me for seeming to dictate to you; but I know you will not quarrel with me for speaking my mind. England then, I will say, has a double mission to fulfill: let her return to Unity, for Unity is the basis of religion; and Unity cannot be obtained but by communion with that great Church, which Christ and His Apostles founded as the common centre of all other Churches, the Holy Roman Church—that is, the Apostolic See. But, in returning to Unity, England must bring us back to social and political Christianity, from which our military despotisms and our mad democracies are equally distant: in fact, if I may sum up my idea in one sentence, I should say, England has to restore herself to the Unity of Catholicity, and afterwards to restore the Catholic nations to the sense and practice of Christianity. This, it seems to me, is England's Mission."

From a letter upholding Confession as a Sacrament, we take the following: "May it not be doubted, whether those who know the truth, and yet use not this means of grace, do 'unfeignedly believe Christ's Holy Gospel,' when they so easily absolve themselves at Matins, and after the easy religious fashions of the day, approach the Blessed Sacrament at an after-breakfast Communion."

We make the following extract from a most eulogistic review of Sermons to Non-Catholics, by "Frederick Oakley, M. A., Priest of the Diocese of Westminster," without one word to intimate that the preacher had deserted the Church of England:

"The second and third discourses, on The Cross of Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary, are most ably done, and deserve careful attention; and the same may be said of those on the Confessional, (Nos. vi and vii.) from which we intend to give an extract as bearing upon and illustrating the principles enunciated in 'Mission Papers', and by our valued correspondent 'D. N.' The Lectures on Sacraments and Sacramental Religion, are likewise treated with remarkable power, and yet with great simplicity and clearness of language, evidencing the fact that Canon Oakley, while a sound and accurate theologian, has exactly discovered the way to influence for good, and with effect, the middle classes of the people of England."

It surely can occasion no surprise, and no regret, when men holding such sentiments, on either extreme, are found going to their own place.

THE DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL CAUSES BILL is not, we are glad to find, to be suffered to come into operation without another effort to arrest its triumph over the principles and consciences of Churchmen. It has been resolved to present a petition to her Majesty, setting forth two or three important points, and begging that the order in Council, necessary to put the Act in operation, may be postponed until Parliament has had time to reconsider the subject. At a late meeting of the London Union on Church Matters, it was resolved to promote the formation of Church Unions in Parishes, so as to secure greater sympathy and support from all classes of the Laity; and it was also proposed that a declaration should be drawn up and signed by the Clergy, pledging themselves not to celebrate those marriages legalized by the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, which are contrary to the law of the Church, and also not to permit the solemnization of such marriages in their Churches or Chapels by any other person.

